E461

E461

SOCIAL PURPOSE By Principal H. J. W. Hetherington and Prof. J. H. Muirhead. *2nd Impression.*

INTRODUCTION TO MATHEMATICAL PHILOSOPHY By Bertrand Russell, F.R.S. *3rd Impression.*

GOD AND PERSONALITY (GIFFORD LECTURES) By Prof. Clement C. J. Webb. (Part I.) *2nd Impression.*

DIVINE PERSONALITY AND HUMAN LIFE (GIFFORD LECTURES) By Prof. Clement C. J. Webb. (Part II.) *2nd Impression.*

MODERN PHILOSOPHY By Guido de Ruggiero. *Translated by A. Howard Hannay and R. G. Collingwood.*

THE ANALYSIS OF MIND By Bertrand Russell, F.R.S. *3rd Impression.*

DIALOGUES ON METAPHYSICS By Nicolas Malebranche. *Translated by Morris Ginsberg.*

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY By Prof. S. Radhakrishnan. *2nd Edition. Two volumes.*

CONTEMPORARY BRITISH PHILOSOPHY Edited by Prof. J. H. Muirhead. *Two Vols. 2nd Impression.*

THE WAYS OF KNOWING: OR, THE METHODS OF PHILOSOPHY By Prof. W. P. Montague. *2nd Impression.*

A THEORY OF DIRECT REALISM; AND THE RELATION OF REALISM TO IDEALISM By J. E. Turner.

THE GOODWILL: A STUDY IN THE COHERENCE THEORY OF GOODNESS By H. J. Paton

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF LIFE: AN ESSAY ON CITIZENSHIP AS PURSUIT OF VALUES By Prof. J. S. Mackenzie

THE INTELLIGIBLE WORLD: METAPHYSICS AND VALUE By Prof. W. M. Urban.

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY Edited by Prof. George P. Adams and Prof. Wm. Pepperell Montague. *Two Vols.*

HEGEL'S SCIENCE OF LOGIC *Translated by W. H. Johnston and L. G. Struthers. Two Vols.*

IDENTITY AND REALITY By Emile Meyerson. *Translated by Kate Loewenberg.*

COLERIDGE AS PHILOSOPHER By Prof. J. H. Muirhead.

MORAL SENSE By James Bonar.

THE PLATONIC TRADITION IN ANGLO-SAXON PHILOSOPHY By Prof. J. H. Muirhead.

IDEAS: AN INTRODUCTION TO PURE PHENOMENOLOGY By Edmund Husserl. *Translated by W. R. Boyce Gibson, M.A., D.Sc. (Oxon).*

Library of Philosophy.
EDITED BY J. H. MUIRHEAD, LL.D.

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

BY

S. RADHAKRISHNAN

KING GEORGE V PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

VOLUME II



LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1927
REVISED SECOND EDITION 1931

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
UNWIN BROTHERS LTD., WOKING

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

I HAVE utilised the opportunity offered by the Second Edition to correct a number of minor errors and misprints, and to extract in a few doubtful and difficult cases the Sanskrit originals so as to enable the reader to compare the interpretations with the text. These latter are found in the Notes at the end of the book, which also include material intended to clear up difficulties or bring the book up-to-date.

The English renderings of Sanskrit texts are generally based on standard translations where available, and these are mentioned in the bibliographical references. These latter are intended mainly as a guide to the literature available in English, though they indirectly point the way to the whole literature on the subject.

I have to thank many friends and critics for their valuable suggestions. I am specially indebted to Professor M. Hiriyanna of Mysore. Among others who helped me with valuable advice are Mahāmahopādhyāya S. Kuppuswāmi Śāstri of Madras and Mahāmahopādhyāya N.S. Anantakrishna Śāstri of Calcutta. My friend and colleague, Mr. K. C. Chatterji, checked the references, and my thanks are due to him.

September 1930

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

IN this volume, which is devoted to the discussion of the six Brahmanical systems, I have adopted the same plan and method of treatment as in the first. I have tried to adopt, what is acknowledged to be, the true spirit of philosophical interpretation, *viz.*, to interpret the ancient writers and their thoughts at their best and relate them to the living issues of philosophy and religion. Vācaspati Miśra, who commented on almost all the systems of Hindu thought, wrote on each, as if he believed in its doctrines. In presenting intelligently tendencies of thought matured long ago and embodied in a number of difficult works, it has been necessary to select, emphasise and even criticise particular aspects, which naturally betrays the direction in which my own thinking runs. Involving as the work does so many decisions on points of detail, it is, perhaps, too much to hope that the book is free from errors of judgment; but I have endeavoured to give an objective treatment and avoid playing tricks with the evidence.

I should repeat here that my discussion is not to be regarded as complete in any sense of the term, for almost every chapter deals with a subject to which a fully equipped specialist devotes a lifetime of study. Detailed discussions of particular systems require separate monographs. My task is the limited one, of sketching in broad outlines the different movements of thought, their motives and their results. I have made practically no attempt to deal with secondary variations of opinion among the less important writers of the various schools. My treatment of the Śaiva, the Śākta and the later Vaiṣṇava systems, which belong more to the religious

history than to the philosophical development of India, has been brief and summary. I shall be thoroughly satisfied if I succeed in conveying an idea, however inadequate, of the real spirit of the several phases of Indian speculative thought.

If this volume is slightly more difficult than the previous one, I hope it will be felt that the difficulty is not entirely of my making, but is to some extent inherent in the subject and in the close thinking which its study involves. To condense a mass of facts into a clear narrative which can be followed by the reader without bewilderment or boredom is a task which I felt to be more than what I could compass. It is for the reader to judge how far I have succeeded in my attempt to steer a middle course between looseness and pedantry. To help the general reader, the more technical and textual discussions are printed in small type.

In the preparation of this volume I have found, not only the Sanskrit texts of the different schools, but also the writings of Deussen and Keith, Thibaut and Garbe, Gangānāth Jhā and Vidyābhūṣaṇ, very helpful. I am greatly indebted to my friends, Mr. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar and Professor J. S. Mackenzie, for their kindness in reading considerable parts of the MS. and the proofs, and making many valuable suggestions. Professor A. Berriedale Keith was good enough to read the proofs, and the book has profited much by his critical comments. My deepest thanks, however, are due, as in the case of the first volume, to the General Editor, Professor J. H. Muirhead, who gave to the work much of his time and thought. But for his generous assistance, the defects of the book—whatever they may be—would have been very much greater. The printing of the work involved considerable trouble, and I am glad that it has been extraordinarily well done.

December 1926

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VII

CHAPTER VIII

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

B.G. . . .	Bhagavadgītā.
B.S. . . .	Brahma Sūtra.
D.S.V. . . .	Deussen's System of the Vedānta—E.T.
I.P.	Indian Philosophy, Vol. I.
N.B. . . .	Nyāya Bhāṣya.
N.S.	Nyāya Sūtra.
N.V. . . .	Nyāyavārttika.
N.V.T.T. . .	Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā.
P.P.	Padārthadharmasaṁgraha of Praśastapāda.
M.S.	Mīmāṁsā Sūtra.
R.B. . . .	Rāmānuja's Bhāṣya on the Brahma Sūtra.
R.B.G. . . .	Rāmānuja's Bhāṣya on the Bhagavadgītā.
S.B. . . .	Śaṁkara's Bhāṣya, or the Brahma Sūtra.
S.B.G. . . .	Śaṁkara's Bhāṣya on the Bhagavadgītā.
S.K.	Sāṁkhya Kārikā.
S.L.S. . . .	Siddhāntaleśasaṁgraha.
S.P.B. . . .	Sāṁkhyapravacana Bhāṣya.
S.P.S. . . .	Sāṁkhyapravacana Sūtra.
S.D.S. . . .	Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha.
S.S.S.S. . .	Sarvasiddhāntasārasaṁgraha.
S.V. . . .	Ślokavārttika.
V.S. . . .	Vaiśeṣika Sūtra.
Y.B. . . .	Yoga Bhāṣya.
Y.S.	Yoga Sūtra.

PART III

THE SIX BRAHMANICAL SYSTEMS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The spirit of the age—The Darśanas—Āstika and Nāstika—Sūtra literature—Date—Common ideas—The six systems.

The Rise of the Systems

THE age of Buddha represents the great springtide of philosophic spirit in India. The progress of philosophy is generally due to a powerful attack on a historical tradition when men feel themselves compelled to go back on their steps and raise once more the fundamental questions which their fathers had disposed of by the older schemes. The revolt of Buddhism and Jainism, even such as it was, forms an era in the history of Indian thought, since it finally exploded the method of dogmatism and helped to bring about a critical point of view. For the great Buddhist thinkers, logic was the main arsenal where were forged the weapons of universal destructive criticism. Buddhism served as a cathartic in clearing the mind of the cramping effects of ancient obstructions. Scepticism, when it is honest, helps to reorganise belief on its natural foundations. The need for laying the foundations deeper resulted in the great movement of philosophy which produced the six systems of thought, where cold criticism and analysis take the place of poetry and religion. The conservative schools were compelled to codify their views and set forth logical defences of them. The critical side of philosophy became as important as the speculative. The philosophical views of the presystematic period set forth some general

reflections regarding the nature of the universe as a whole, but did not realise that a critical theory of knowledge is the necessary basis of any fruitful speculation. Critics forced their opponents to employ the natural methods relevant to life and experience, and not some supernatural revelation, in the defence of their speculative schemes. We should not lower our standards to let in the beliefs we wish to secure. Ātmavidyā or philosophy is now supported by Ānvīkṣikī or the science of inquiry.[1] A rationalistic defence of philosophic systems could not have been very congenial to the conservative mind.[2] To the devout it must have appeared that the breath of life had departed since intuition had given place to critical reason. The force of thought which springs straight from life and experience as we have it in the Upaniṣads, or the epic greatness of soul which sees and chants the God-vision as in the *Bhagavadgītā* give place to more strict philosophising. Again, when an appeal to reason is admitted, one cannot be sure of the results of thought. A critical philosophy need not always be in conformity with cherished traditions. But the spirit of the times required that every system of thought based on reason should be recognised as a darśana. All logical attempts to gather the floating conceptions of the world into some great general ideas were regarded as darśanas.[3] They all help us to see some aspect of the truth. This conception led to the view that the apparently isolated and independent systems were really

[1] N.B., i. 1. 1.; *Manu*, vii. 43. Kauṭilya (about 300 B.C.) asserts that Ānvīkṣikī is a distinct branch of study over and above the other three, Trayī or the Vedas, Vārtā or commerce, and Daṇḍanīti or polity (i. 2). The sixth century B.C., when it was recognised as a special study, marks the beginning of systematic philosophy in India, and by the first century B.C. the term Ānvīkṣikī is replaced by "darśana" (see M.B., Śāntiparva, 10. 45; *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, viii. 14. 10). Every inquiry starts in doubt and fulfils a need. Cp. Jijñāsayā saṁdehaprayojane sūcayati (*Bhāmatī*, i. 1. 1).

[2] In the Rāmāyaṇa, Ānvīkṣikī is censured as leading men away from the injunctions of the dharmaśāstras (ii. 100. 36) (M.B., Śānti, 180. 47–49; 246–8). Manu holds that those who misled by logic (hetuśāstra) disregard the Vedas and the Dharma Sūtras deserve excommunication (ii. 11); yet both Gautama in his Dharma Sūtra (xi) and Manu (vii. 43) prescribe a course of Ānvīkṣikī for kings. Logicians were included in the legislative assemblies. When logic supports scripture, it is commended. By means of Ānvīkṣikī, Vyāsa claims to have arranged the Vedas (*Nyāyasūtravṛtti*, i. 1. 1).

[3] Mādhava: S.D.S.

members of a larger historical plan. Their nature could not be completely understood so long as they were viewed as self-dependent, without regard to their place in the historic interconnection.

II

Relation to the Vedas

The adoption of the critical method served to moderate the impetuosity of the speculative imagination and helped to show that the pretended philosophies were not so firmly held as their professors supposed. But the iconoclastic fervour of the materialists, the sceptics and some followers of Buddhism destroyed all grounds of certitude. The Hindu mind did not contemplate this negative result with equanimity. Man cannot live on doubt. Intellectual pugilism is not sufficient by itself. The zest of combat cannot feed the spirit of man. If we cannot establish through logic the truth of anything, so much the worse for logic. It cannot be that the hopes and aspirations of sincere souls like the ṛṣis of the Upaniṣads are irrevocably doomed. It cannot be that centuries of struggle and thought have not brought the mind one step nearer to the solution. Despair is not the only alternative. Reason assailed could find refuge in faith. The seers of the Upaniṣads are the great teachers in the school of sacred wisdom. They speak to us of the knowledge of God and spiritual life. If the unassisted reason of man cannot attain any hold on reality by means of mere speculation, help may be sought from the great writings of the seers who claim to have attained spiritual certainty. Thus strenuous attempts were made to justify by reason what faith implicitly accepts. This is not an irrational attitude, since philosophy is only an endeavour to interpret the widening experience of humanity. The one danger that we have to avoid is lest faith should furnish the conclusions for philosophy.

Of the systems of thought or darśanas, six became more famous than others, *viz.*, Gautama's Nyāya, Kaṇāda's Vaiśeṣika, Kapila's Sāṁkhya, Patañjali's Yoga, Jaimini's Pūrva Mīmāṁsā

and Bādarāyaṇa's Uttara Mīmāṁsā or the Vedānta.[1] They are the Brahmanical systems, since they all accept the authority of the Vedas. The systems of thought which admit the validity of the Vedas are called āstika, and those which repudiate it nāstika. The āstika, or nāstika character of a system does not depend on its positive or negative conclusions regarding the nature of the supreme spirit, but on the acceptance or non-acceptance of the authority of the Vedas.[2] Even the schools of Buddhism have their origin in the Upaniṣads; though they are not regarded as orthodox, since they do not accept the authority of the Vedas. Kumārila, a great authority on these questions, admits that the Buddhist systems owe their inspiration to the Upaniṣads, argues that they were put forth with the purpose of checking the excessive attachment to sensuous objects, and declares that they are all authoritative systems of thought.[3]

The acceptance of the Veda is a practical admission that spiritual experience is a greater light in these matters than intellectual reason. It does not mean either full agreement with all the doctrines of the Veda or admission of any belief in the existence of God. It means only a serious attempt to solve the ultimate mystery of existence; for even the infallibility of the Veda is not admitted by the schools in the same sense. As we shall see, the Vaiśeṣika and the Nyāya accept God as the result of inference. The Sāṁkhya is not a theism. The Yoga is practically independent of the Veda. The two Mīmāṁsās are more directly dependent on the Vedas. The Pūrva Mīmāṁsā derives the general conception of deity from the Vedas, but is not anxious about the supreme spirit. The Uttara Mīmāṁsā accepts God on the basis of śruti assisted by inference, while realisation of God can be had through meditation and jñāna. Theistically minded thinkers of a later day declined to include the Sāṁkhya under orthodox darśanas.[4]

1 Haribhadra, in his *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, discusses the Buddhist, the Naiyāyika, and the Sāṁkhya, the Jaina, the Vaiśeṣika, and the Jaiminīya systems (i. 3). Jinadatta and Rājaśekhara agree with this view.

2 Prāmāṇyabuddhir vedeṣu. Manu says that a nāstika is he who despises the Vedas. Nāstiko vedanindakaḥ (ii. 11). See M.B., xii. 270. 67.

3 *Tantravārttika*, i. 3. 2, p. 81.

4 In Bhīmācārya's *Nyāyakośa* the āstika is said to be paralokādyastitvavādi and nāstika as vedamārgam ananurundhānaḥ. He includes Sāṁkhya and the Advaita Vedānta under the latter. " Māyāvādivedānty api nāstika

The philosophical character of the systems is not much compromised by the acceptance of the Veda.[1] The distinction between śruti and smṛti is well known, and where the two conflict, the former is to prevail. The śruti itself is divided into the karmakāṇḍa (the Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas and the jñānakāṇḍa (the Upaniṣads). The latter is of higher value, though much of it is set aside as mere arthavāda or non-essential statements. All these distinctions enable one to treat the Vedic testimony in a very liberal spirit. The interpretations of the Vedic texts depend on the philosophical predilections of the authors. While employing logical methods and arriving at truths agreeable to reason, they were yet anxious to preserve their continuity with the ancient texts. They did not wish it to be thought that they were enunciating something completely new. While this may involve a certain want of frankness with themselves, it helped the spread of what they regarded as the truth.[2] Critics and commentators of different schools claim for their views the sanction of the Veda and exercise their ingenuity in forcing that sanction when it is not spontaneously yielded. In the light of the controversies of subsequent times, they read into the language of the Vedas opinions on questions of which they knew little or nothing. The general conceptions of the Vedas were neither definite nor detailed, and so allowed themselves to be handled and fashioned in different ways by different schools of thought. Besides, the very vastness of the Vedas, from

eva paryavasāne saṁpadyate." Kumārila regards the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga, the Pañcarātra and the Pāśupata systems as being opposed to the Veda as much as Buddhism (*Tantravārttika*, i. 3. 4).

[1] What Keith says of the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika is true of the other systems as well. "The systems are indeed orthodox and admit the authority of the sacred scriptures, but they attack the problems of existence with human means, and scripture serves for all practical purposes but to lend sanctity to results which are achieved not only without its aid, but often in very dubious harmony with its tenets" (I.L.A., p. 3).

[2] Cp. Goethe: "Some very intelligent and brilliant men appeared, in this respect, like butterflies which, quite oblivious of their chrysalis state, threw away the covering in which they had grown to their organic maturity. Others, more faithful and more modest, could be compared with flowers, which, though developing into beautiful blossoms, do not leave the root nor separate themselves from the mother stem, but rather through this connection bring the hoped-for fruit to ripeness" (quoted in Merz: *European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. iv, p. 134, fn. 1).

which the authors could select out of free conviction any portion for their authority, allowed room for original thought.

The religious motive of philosophical speculations accounts for the apparently miscellaneous character of the contents of the systems. The eternity of sound doctrine is more a theological than a philosophical problem, related as it is to the doctrine of Vedic infallibility. Every system is an admixture of logic and psychology, metaphysics and religion.

III

The Sūtras

When the Vedic literature became unwieldy and the Vedic thinkers were obliged to systematise their views, the Sūtra literature arose. The principal tenets of the darśanas are stated in the form of sūtras or short aphorisms. They are intended to be as short as possible, free from doubt, able to bring out the essential meaning and put an end to many doubts; and they must not contain anything superfluous or erroneous.[1] They try to avoid all unnecessary repetition and employ great economy of words.[2] The ancient writers had no temptation to be diffuse, since they had to rely more on memory than on printed books. This extreme conciseness makes it difficult to understand the Sūtras without a commentary.

The different systems developed in different centres of philosophical activity. The views had been growing up through many generations even before they were summed up in the Sūtras. They are not the work of one thinker or of one age but of a succession of thinkers spread over a number of generations. As the Sūtras presuppose a period of gestation and of formation, it is difficult for us to trace their origin. There are no absolute beginnings for spiritual possessions.

[1] Alpākṣaram asaṁdigdhaṁ sāravad viśvatomukham
Astobham anavadyaṁ ca sūtraṁ sūtravido viduḥ

(Madhva on B.S., i. 1. 1). See Jayatīrtha's *Nyāyasudhā*, i. 1. 1; *Bhāmatī*, i. 1. 1.

[2] The remark that "a grammarian rejoices in the economising of half a short vowel as much as he does on the birth of a son" points to the ideal of the rigid economy of words.

The Sūtras are the outcome of a series of past efforts and "occupy a strictly central position summarising, on the one hand, a series of early literary essays extending over many generations, and forming, on the other hand, the headspring of an ever-broadening activity of commentators as well as virtually independent writers, which reaches down to our days and may yet have some future before itself."[1] The systems must have evolved at a much earlier period than that in which the Sūtras were formulated. The whole tone and manner of the philosophical Sūtras suggests that they belong approximately to the same period.[2] The authors of the Sūtras are not the founders or originators of the systems but only their compilers or formulators. This fact accounts for the cross references in the philosophical Sūtras, and it must be noted that the various systems had been growing side by side with one another during the period which preceded the formation of the Sūtras. To the early centuries after Buddha and before the Christian era belongs the crystallisation of the different systems out of the complex solution. Oral tradition and not books were the repositories of the philosophical views. It may be that, through lapse of oral tradition, several important works perished, and many of those that have reached us are not even pure. Some of the earlier important Sūtras, as the Bṛhaspati Sūtras, Vaikhānasa Sūtras and Bhikṣu Sūtras, as well as large quantities of philosophical literature, are lost to us, and with them also much useful information about the chronological relations of the different systems. Max Müller assigns the gradual formation of the Sūtras to the period from Buddha to Aśoka, though he admits that, in the cases of the Vedānta, the Sāṁkhya and the Yoga, a long previous development has to be allowed. This view is confirmed by the evidence of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*. Up till then, the orthodox Ānvīkṣiki or logical systems were divided mainly into two schools, the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and the Sāṁkhya. Though the references in Buddhist texts are very

[1] Thibaut: Introduction to S.B., p. xii.

[2] In some form the different systems must have existed before the Christian era. The early sacred literature of the Jainas mentions the systems of Vaiśeṣika, Buddhism, Sāṁkhya, Lokāyata and Ṣaṣṭitantra (Weber's *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 236, n. 249) See also *Lalitavistara*, xii; *Carakasaṁhitā*; M.B., Nārāyaṇīya section.

vague, it may be said that the Buddhist Sūtras assume a knowledge of the six systems. The vivid intellectual life of the early centuries after Buddha flowed in many streams parallel to one another, though the impulse to codify them was due to the reaction against the systems of revolt. These systems of thought undergo modifications at the hands of later interpreters, though the resultant system is still fathered on the original systematiser. The philosophy of the Vedānta is called Vyāsa's, though Śaṁkara, Rāmānuja and a host of others introduced vital changes of doctrine. The greatest thinkers of India profess to be simply scholiasts; but in their attempts to expound the texts, they improve on them. Each system has grown in relation to others which it keeps always in view. The development of the six systems has been in progress till the present day, the successive interpreters defending the tradition against the attacks of its opponents.

In the case of every darśana, we have first of all a period of philosophic fermentation, which at a particular stage is reduced to sūtras or aphorisms. This is succeeded by the writing of commentaries on the aphorisms, which are followed by glosses, expositions and explanatory compendia, in which the original doctrines undergo modifications, corrections and amplifications. The commentaries use the form of the dialogue, which has come down from the time of the Upaniṣads as the only adequate form for the exposition of a complex theme. The commentator by means of the dialogue is enabled to show the relation of the view he is expounding to the diverse trains of thought suggested by the rival interlocutors. The ideas are restated and their superiority to other conceptions established.

IV

Common Ideas

The six systems agree on certain essentials.[1] The accept-

[1] "The longer I have studied the various systems, the more have I become impressed with the truth of the view taken by Vijñānabhikṣu and others that there is behind the variety of the six systems a common fund of what may be called national or popular philosophy, a large mānasa lake of philosophical thought and language far away in the distant North and in the distant past, from which each thinker was allowed to draw for his own purposes" (Max Müller: S.S., p. xvii).

ance of the Veda implies that all the systems have drawn from a common reservoir of thought. The Hindu teachers were obliged to use the heritage they received from the past, in order to make their views readily understood. While the use of the terms avidyā, māyā, puruṣa, jīva shows that the dialect of speculation is common to the different systems, it is to be noted that the systems are distinguished by the different significations assigned to those terms in the different schools. It frequently happens in the history of thought that the same terms and phrases are used by different schools in senses which are essentially distinct. Each system sets forth its special doctrine by using, with necessary modifications, the current language of the highest religious speculation. In the systems, philosophy becomes self-conscious. The spiritual experiences recorded in the Vedas are subjected to a logical criticism. The question of the validity and means of knowledge forms an important chapter of each system. Each philosophical scheme has its own theory of knowledge, which is an integral part or a necessary consequence of its metaphysics. Intuition, inference and the Veda are accepted by the systems. Reason is subordinated to intuition. Life cannot be comprehended in its fulness by logical reason. Self-consciousness is not the ultimate category of the universe. There is something transcending the consciousness of self, to which many names are given—Intuition, Revelation, Cosmic Consciousness, and God-vision. We cannot describe it adequately, so we call it the super-consciousness. When we now and then have glimpses of this higher form, we feel that it involves a purer illumination and a wider compass. As the difference between mere consciousness and self-consciousness constitutes the wide gulf separating the animal from man, so the difference between self-consciousness and super-consciousness constitutes all the difference between man as he is and man as he ought to be. The philosophy of India takes its stand on the spirit which is above mere logic, and holds that culture based on mere logic or science may be efficient, but cannot be inspiring.

All the systems protest against the scepticism of the Buddhists, and erect a standard of objective reality and truth as opposed to an eternal, unstable flux. The stream of the world has been flowing on from eternity, and this flow is

not merely mental, but is objective; and it is traced to the eternal prakṛti or māyā or atoms. "That in which the world resides, when divested of name and form, some call prakṛti, others māyā, others atoms." [1] It is assumed that whatever has a beginning has an end. Everything that is made up of parts can be neither eternal nor self-subsistent. The true individual is indivisible. The real is not the universe extended in space and time; for its nature is becoming and not being. There is something deeper than this—atoms and souls, or puruṣa and prakṛti, or Brahman.

All the systems accept the view of the great world rhythm. Vast periods of creation, maintenance and dissolution follow each other in endless succession. This theory is not inconsistent with belief in progress; for it is not a question of the movement of the world reaching its goal times without number, and being again forced back to its starting-point. Creations and dissolutions do not mean the fresh rise and the total destruction of the cosmos. The new universe forms the next stage of the history of the cosmos, where the unexhausted potencies of good and evil are provided with the opportunities of fulfilment. It means that the race of man enters upon and retravels its ascending path of realisation. This interminable succession of world ages has no beginning.

Except perhaps the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā, all the systems aim at the practical end of salvation. The systems mean by release (mokṣa) the recovery by the soul of its natural integrity, from which sin and error drive it. All the systems have for their ideal complete mental poise and freedom from the discords and uncertainties, sorrows and sufferings of life, "a repose that ever is the same," which no doubts disturb and no rebirths break into. The conception of jīvanmukti, or liberation in life, is admitted in many schools.

It is a fundamental belief of the Hindus that the universe is law-abiding to the core, and yet that man is free to shape his own destiny in it.

> Our actions still pursue us from afar,
> And what we have been makes us what we are.

[1] Vijñānabhikṣu quotes from *Bṛhadvāśiṣṭha* in his *Yogavārttika*:
Nāmarūpavinirmuktaṁ yasmin saṁtiṣṭhate jagat
Tam āhuḥ prakṛtiṁ kecin māyām anye pare tv aṇūn

The systems believe in rebirth and preexistence. Our life is a step on a road, the direction and goal of which are lost in the infinite. On this road, death is never an end or an obstacle but at most the beginning of new steps. The development of the soul is a continuous process, though it is broken into stages by the recurring baptism of death.

Philosophy carries us to the gates of the promised land, but cannot let us in; for that, insight or realisation is necessary. We are like children stranded in the darkness of saṁsāra, with no idea of our true nature, and inclined to imagine fears and to cling to hopes in the gloom that surrounds us. Hence arises the need for light, which will free us from the dominion of passions and show us the real, which we unwittingly are, and the unreal in which we ignorantly live. Such a kind of insight is admitted as the sole means to salvation, though there are differences regarding the object of insight.[1] The cause of bondage is ignorance, and so release can be had through insight into the truth. The ideal of the systems is practically to transcend the merely ethical level. The holy man is compared to the fair lotus unsullied by the mire in which it grows. In his case the good is no more a goal to be striven after, but is an accomplished fact. While virtue and vice may lead to a good or bad life within the circle of saṁsāra, we can escape from saṁsāra through the transcending of the moralistic individualism. All systems recognise as obligatory unselfish love and disinterested activity, and insist on cittaśuddhi (cleansing of the heart) as essential to all moral culture. In different degrees they adhere to the rules of caste (varṇa) and stages of life (āśrama).

A history of Indian philosophy, as we noted in the Introduction,[2] is beset with innumerable difficulties. The dates of the principal writers and their works are not free from doubt; and in some cases the historicity of well-known authors is contested While many of the relevant works are not available, even the few that are published have not all been critically studied. A historical treatment of Indian philosophy

[1] Even the Buddhist thinker Dharmakīrti opens his *Nyāyabindu* with the remark that all fulfilment of human desires is preceded by right knowledge. Samyagjñānapūrvikā sarvapuruṣārthasiddhiḥ (i)

[2] I P.. vol. i.

has not been taken up by the great Indian thinkers themselves. Mādhava in his *Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha* treats of sixteen different darśanas. In the first volume we dealt with the materialist, the Buddhist and the Jaina views. In this we propose to deal with the Nyāya, the Vaiśeṣika, the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga, the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and the Vedānta darśanas. The four schools of Śaivism and those of Rāmānuja, the Pūrṇaprajña are founded on the Vedānta Sūtra and attempt to interpret it in different ways. Pāṇini's system is of little philosophical significance. It accepts the Mīmāṁsā view of the eternity of sound and develops the theory of sphoṭa or the indivisible unitary factor latent in every word as the vehicle of its significance. Of these six systems, the Vaiśeṣika is not very much in honour, while the Nyāya on its logical side is popular and finds many devotees, especially in Bengal. The Yoga in its practical form is practised by a few, while the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā is closely related to Hindu law. The Sāṁkhya is not a living faith, while the Vedānta in its different forms pervades the whole atmosphere. In dealing with the six systems of Hindu thought, we shall confine our attention to the great classics, the Sūtras as well as their chief commentators. With regard to almost all the thinkers of recent times—of course there are exceptions—their metaphysical contributions do not seem to be sufficiently impressive. Their learning is prodigious; but they belong to the period of decadence, where the tendency to comment and recast ceaselessly takes the place of creation and construction. There are too many concessions to dogma, too much attachment to the mystifying elaboration of the obvious and, by reason of the warping theological bias and metaphysical sterility, do not deserve any great attention.

In obedience to custom, which it would be vain to try to unsettle, we shall start with the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika theories, which give us an analysis of the world of experience, and pass on to the Sāṁkhya and the Yoga, which try to explain experience by bold speculative ventures; and we shall conclude with a discussion of the Mīmāṁsās, which attempt to show that the revelations of śruti are in harmony with the conclusions of philosophy. Such a treatment has at least the support of sound logic though not of sound chronology.

CHAPTER II

THE LOGICAL REALISM OF THE NYĀYA

The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika—The beginnings of the Nyāya—Literature and history—Aim and scope—The nature of definition—Perception—Its analysis and kinds—Inference—Syllogism—Induction—Causation—Plurality of causes—Asatkāryavāda—Criticism of the Nyāya view of causation—Comparison—Verbal knowledge—Authoritativeness of the Vedas—Other forms of knowledge—Aitihya and Arthāpatti, Saṁbhava and Abhāva—Tarka, Vāda, Nigrahasthāna—Memory—Doubt—Fallacies—Truth, its nature and criterion—Theories of error—The Nyāya theory of knowledge examined—The world of nature—The individual soul—Saṁsāra—Mokṣa—Criticism of the Nyāya theory of soul and its relation to consciousness—Ethics—Proofs for the existence of God—Conclusion.

I

THE NYĀYA AND THE VAIŚEṢIKA

WHILE the other systems of Indian thought are mainly speculative, in the sense that they deal with the universe as a whole, the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika represent the analytic type of philosophy, and uphold common sense and science, instead of dismissing them as "moonbeams from the larger lunacy." What is distinctive of these schools, is the application of a method, which their adherents regard as that of science, to material which has hitherto been treated in quite a different way. Applying the methods of logical inquiry and criticism, they endeavour to show that these do not warrant the conclusions which the Buddhist thinkers derived from them, and that logic does not compel us to disperse the unity and pattern of life into its fleeting moments. They are interested mainly in averting the sceptical consequences of the Buddhist phenomenalism, which merged external reality in the ideas of mind. They seek to restore the traditional substances, the soul within and nature without, but not on the

basis of mere authority. The general scepticism which set in like a flood, could not be checked by a mere resort to faith, when its citadel was attacked by the heretical thinkers who presumably took their stand on the evidence of the senses and the conclusions of reason. Only by a thorough examination of the modes and sources of correct knowledge can the ends of life and religion be truly met. What is supplied to us by scripture or the evidence of the senses must be submitted to a critical inquiry, as the etymological meaning of the word ānvīkṣikī suggests.[1] The Naiyāyika is willing to admit as true whatever is established by reason.[2] Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara urge that if the Nyāya philosophy dealt only with the nature of the soul and its released condition, there would not be much to distinguish the Nyāya from the Upaniṣads which also treat of these problems. That which gives distinction to the Nyāya is its critical treatment of metaphysical problems. Vācaspati defines the purpose of the Nyāya as a critical examination of the objects of knowledge by means of the canons of logical proof.[3]

The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika take up the ordinary stock notions of traditional philosophy, as space, time, cause, matter, mind, soul and knowledge, explore their significance for experience, and set forth the results in the form of a theory of the universe. The logical and the physical departments become the predominant features in these traditions. The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika take up respectively the world within and the world without. The Nyāya describes at great length the mechanism of knowledge and argues vigorously against the scepticism which declares that nothing is certain. The Vaiśeṣika has for its main objective the analysis of experience. It formulates general conceptions which apply to things known, whether by the senses or by inference or by authority. Adopting such an attitude, it is no wonder that

[1] Pratyakṣāgamābhyām ākṣiptasya anvīkṣā tayā vartata ity ānvīkṣikī (N.B., i. 1. 1). Again: "It is called anvīkṣā or investigation, since it consists in the reviewing (anu-īkṣaṇa) of a thing previously apprehended (īkṣita) by perception and verbal testimony" (N.B., i. 1. 1). Logic is the science of second intentions, as Aristotle would say It is essentially the reflection of knowledge on itself.

[2] Buddhyā yad upapannaṁ tat sarvaṁ nyāyamatam.

[3] Cf. Pramāṇair arthaparīkṣaṇam (N. B. and N.V.T.T., i. 1. 1).

the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika systems advocate belief in individual souls as substantial beings, interacting with a whole environing system of things.

The two systems had been for long treated as parts of one whole. It is sometimes suggested that they branched off as independent streams from the same original source, which treated of things known and the means of knowledge. It is, however, difficult to be certain on this point. The later works regard these systems as forming parts of one discipline.[1] Even in the *Nyāya Bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana, the two are not kept distinct. The Vaiśeṣika is used as a supplement to the Nyāya.[2] Uddyotakara's *Nyāyavārttika* uses the Vaiśeṣika doctrines. Jacobi observes that "the fusion of these two schools began early and seems to have been complete at the time when the *Nyāyavārttika* was written."[3] Many of the Nyāya sūtras presuppose the tenets of the Vaiśeṣika. They are called samānatantra or allied systems, since they both believe in a plurality of souls, a personal God, an atomic universe, and use many arguments in common. While there is no doubt that the two systems coalesced very early, a difference in the distribution of emphasis on the logical and the physical sides distinguishes the one from the other.[4] While the Nyāya gives us an account of the processes and methods of a reasoned knowledge of objects, the Vaiśeṣika develops the atomic constitution of things which the Nyāya accepts without much argument.[5]

[1] See Varadarāja's *Tārkikarakṣā*, Keśava Miśra's *Tarkabhāṣā*, Śivāditya's *Saptapadārthī*, Viśvanātha's *Bhāṣāpariccheda* and *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, Annam Bhaṭṭa's *Tarkasaṁgraha* and *Dīpikā*, Jagadīśa's *Tarkāmṛta*, and Laugākṣi Bhāskara's *Tarkakaumudī* The Buddhist thinkers Āryadeva and Harivarman did not look upon the Nyāya as a system independent of the Vaiśeṣika (Ui: *Vaiśeṣika Philosophy*, pp. 54 and 56).

[2] N.B., i. 1. 4. Vātsyāyana quotes V.S., iii. 1. 16 in N.B., ii. 2. 34; V.S., iv. 1. 6 in N.B., iii. 1. 33 and iii. 1. 67.

[3] E.R.E., vol. ii, p. 201 *b*.

[4] Uddyotakara says that "the other sciences are not meant to deal with the subjects (of pramāṇas), though they deal with things made known by them (N.V., i. 1. 1).

[5] Garbe looks upon the Vaiśeṣika as prior to the Nyāya (E.R.E., vol. xii, p. 569; see also *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 20; Jacobi: J.A.O.S., xxxi), while Goldstucker regards the Vaiśeṣika as a branch of the Nyāya. Keith inclines to the former view (I.L.A., pp. 21–22). It is more logical, since critical investigations generally follow dogmatic metaphysics. The more systematic character of the N.S., the greater attention paid to the problems

The Nyāya philosophy has been held in great reverence for a very long time past. Manu includes it under śruti. Yājñavalkya regards it as one of the four limbs of the Veda.[1] The classical studies of the Hindus comprise the five subjects of Kāvya (literature), Nāṭaka (drama), Alaṁkāra (rhetoric), Tarka (logic), and Vyākaraṇa (grammar). Whatever other specialised studies a student may take up later, the preliminary course includes logic, which is the basis of all studies. Every system of Hindu thought accepts the fundamental principles of the Nyāya logic, and even in criticising the Nyāya system, uses the Nyāya terminology and logic. The Nyāya serves as an introduction to all systematic philosophy.[2]

II

The Beginnngs of the Nyāya

Ānvīkṣikī, as we have seen, is the treatment in a consciously critical manner of the ultimate problems of spirit; and it has been used in a comprehensive sense, so as to include all systematic attempts to solve the problems of philosophy, the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga and the Lokāyata. Soon attention was directed to the nature of logical procedure and criticism, used in common by these different systems of thought. Every science is a nyāya, which means literally going into a subject

of the eternity of sound, the nature of the self and the process of inference support Keith's view. The explicit reference to Īśvara in N.S., iv. 1. 19, is more than what the Vaiśeṣika has to say on this question. The argument for the existence of the self from bodily activities is cruder than the Nyāya view of self as the basis of mental phenomena. The absence of any direct reference to the Nyāya in the B.S., which criticises the Vaiśeṣika theory (ii. 2. 12–17), supports the view of the greater antiquity of the latter. This position will be considerably strengthened if the Nyāya reference to pratitantrasiddhānta is taken as an allusion to the Vaiśeṣika. The more elaborate account of the grounds of inference and the simpler scheme of fallacies in the V.S. are not of great value on the question of date. We find a number of coincidences between the N.S. and the V.S Cp. N.S., iii. 1. 36; ii. 1. 54; i. 1. 10; iii. 1. 28; iii 1. 35; iii 1. 63; iii. 1. 71; iii. 2. 63, with V.S., iv. 1. 8; vii. 2. 20; iii. 2. 4; iv. 2. 3; iv. 1 6–13, vii. 2. 4–5; viii. 2. 5; vii. 1. 23, respectively. If some of the V S. seem to be elaborations of the Nyāya views, it only shows that those sūtras were compiled later than the N.S. The priority of the bulk of V.S. is not affected thereby.

[1] *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, i. 3. Cp. *Ātmopaniṣad*, ii, and *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, iii. 6.

[2] Cp. Kauṭilya (i. 2), quoted in N.B., i. 1. 1.

or analytic investigation. The system of Nyāya, which studies the general plan and method of critical inquiries, may be called the science of sciences. Such purely logical studies were encouraged by the Mīmāṁsakas, who were not merely exegetes but also logicians. It may well be that logic arose out of the necessities of the sacrificial religion, especially out of the need that existed for interpreting correctly the Vedic texts regarding sacrificial rites, rules and results; and that hence the thinkers who founded and developed the Mīmāṁsā helped the growth of logic.[1] When Gautama expounded the logical side more carefully than other thinkers, his view became identified with the Ānvīkṣikī. Thus a term which was used for long in the general sense of systematic philosophy became narrowed down in signification.[2]

In the long chain of antecedents out of which the Nyāya evolved, an important place will have to be assigned to dialectical discussions.[3] The Nyāya is called sometimes Tarkavidyā or the science of debate, Vādavidyā, or the science of discussion. Discussion or vāda is the breath of intellectual life. We are obliged to use it in the search for truth, which is complex in character and yields only to the co-operation of many minds.[4] The Upaniṣads speak of learned assemblies

[1] From the names of the Mīmāṁsā works, like Mādhava's *Nyāyamālavistara*, Pārthasārathi Miśra's *Nyāyaratnākara*, and Āpadeva's *Nyāyaprakāśa*, it is evident that the term Nyāya was used as a synonym for Mīmāṁsā. See also Āpastamba's *Dharma Sūtra*, ii. 4. 8. 23; ii. 6. 14. 3.

[2] See also *Manu*, vii. 43; Gautama's *Dharma Sūtra*, xi; *Rāmāyaṇa*, Ayodhyākāṇḍa, 100. 36; M.B., Śāntiparva, 180. 47.

[3] The first sūtra enumerates the topics considered in the system, which are: (1) pramāṇa, the means of knowledge; (2) prameya, the objects of knowledge; (3) saṁśaya, doubt; (4) prayojana, purpose; (5) dṛṣṭānta, example; (6) siddhānta, accepted truth; (7) avayava, members of the syllogism; (8) tarka, indirect proof; (9) nirṇaya, determination of the truth; (10) vāda, discussion; (11) jalpa, wrangling; (12) vitaṇḍā, cavil or destructive criticism; (13) hetvābhāsa, fallacious reasons; (14) chala, quibbling; (15) jāti, futile objections; and (16) nigrahasthāna, occasions for reproof. The first nine are more strictly logical than the last seven, which have the negative function of preventing erroneous knowledge. They are more weapons for the destroying of error than for the building up of truth.

[4] Socrates practised it. Plato's works illustrate its value for the attainment of truth. Aristotle says: "Some see one side of a matter and others another, but all together can see all sides" (*Politics*). Milton's *Areopagitica* and Mill's *Essay on Liberty* praise the method of free discussion

or pariṣads where philosophical disputations were carried on.[1] Greek logic owed much to the Sophistic movement, which adopted the mode of disputation called Dialectic, the game of question and answer. In the practice of the art of discussion, the Sophists not only discovered the true principles of reasoning but also invented tricks of argument and sophisms. From the *Dialogues* of Plato we learn that Socrates used the art of debate for the purpose of eliciting the truth. Aristotle devoted two of his logical treatises, the *Topics* and the *Sophistical Refutations* to the guidance of disputants, questioners as well as respondents, though he distinguished logic from rhetoric, the principles of reasoning from the rules of debate. There is no doubt that Gautama's logic sprang from the dialectical tournaments, the sound of which filled the durbars of kings and the schools of philosophers. The attempt to regulate the use of debates led to the development of logical theory. Gautama, like Aristotle, systematised the principles of reasoning, distinguished the true from the false, and gave an elaborate account of the various forms of sophisms and argumentative tricks. The sixteen topics mentioned in the first sūtra may be regarded as representing stages in dialectical controversy intended to lead up to knowledge.[2] Many of the later works on logic discuss the rules of debate,[3] while all of them refer to dialectical problems.[4]

Jayanta asserts that, though Gautama's work provides the most satisfactory account of the subject, there was logic before Gautama, even as Mīmāṁsā was before Jaimini and grammar before Pāṇini.[5]

[1] See Chān. Up., v. 3. 1; Bṛh. Up., vi. 2. 1; *Praśna*, i. 6. See also *Manu*, vi 50; viii. 269; xii. 106; M.B., Śāntiparva, 180. 47; 246. 18. In *Manu*, xii. 110–111, *Parāśara*, viii. 19, and *Yājñavalkya*, i. 9, *Parivāra* of the Vinaya Piṭaka, details regarding the pariṣads are mentioned.

[2] See also N.B., i. 1. 1.

[3] *Tārkikarakṣā*.

[4] Kauṭilya mentions thirty-two technical terms called Tantrayukti, and this list is also found in *Carakasaṁhitā*, Siddhisthāna, xii, and *Suśrutasaṁhitā*, Uttaratantra, lxv. The ānvīkṣikī portion of Caraka's work deals extensively with the rules of debate (Vimānasthāna, viii).

[5] Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇ is of opinion that a number of writers made contributions to Indian logic before the author of the Sūtra. He mentions the names of Dattātreya, Punarvasu Ātreya, Sulabhā the lady ascetic, and Aṣṭāvakra (*History of Indian Logic*, pp. 9–17).

The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* refers to Vākovākya,[1] which Śaṁkara interprets as *Tarkaśāstra*.[2] The *Mahābhārata* refers to Tarkaśāstra and Ānvīkṣikī,[3] and states that Nārada was familiar with the Nyāya syllogism as well as the Vaiśeṣika principles of conjunction and inherence. Viśvanātha quotes from some Pūrāṇa a passage to the effect that the Nyāya is counted among the subsidiary parts (upāṅgas) of the Veda.[4] Though Buddha's system was eminently rational, we do not come across any systematic treatment of logical theory in the early canonical works. There are, however, references to men skilled in logic. The *Brahmajāla Sutta* refers to Takki (sophist), and Vīmaṁsi (casuist).[5] The name *Anumāna Sutta* of Majjhima Nikāya perhaps indicates the use of the word " anumāna " in the sense of inference. *Kathāvattu* uses the terms patiññā, upanaya, niggaha in their technical signification.[6] The *Yamaka* knows of the distribution of terms and the rules of conversion. The *Paṭisaṁbhidāmagga* refers to the analysis of words and things. *Nettipakaraṇa* shows a great appreciation of logical theory. In the *Questions of Milinda* the Nyāya system is perhaps referred to under the name Nīti.[7] *Lalitavistara* mentions logic under the name of Hetuvidyā. The Jaina Āgamas testify to the antiquity of Indian logic. *Anuyogadvāra* composed by Āryarakṣita who lived about the first century A.D. has the same division of anumāna into pūrvavat, śeṣavat and sāmānyatodṛṣṭa as the Sūtra of Gautama. Āryarakṣita seems to have been only a redactor of an earlier work referred to in the *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, one of the aṅgas of the Jaina canon settled at the Pataliputra Council in the beginning of the third century B.C. Probably the doctrine of the three kinds of inference is earlier than the third century B.C.

[1] vii. 1 2.

[2] See also *Subāla Up.*, ii. Some of the later Upaniṣads use the term pramāṇa in the technical sense. See *Maitrī Up.*, 6. 6, 24 ; *Nṛsiṁhottaratāpaṇi*, 8 ; *Sarvopaniṣatsāra*, 4 ; *Kālāgnirudropaniṣad*, 7 ; *Muktikopaniṣad*, 2. The *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* refers to smṛti or scripture, pratyakṣa or perception, aitihya or tradition, and anumāna or inference as the four sources of knowledge. See also *Rāmāyaṇa*, v. 87–23 ; *Manu*, xii. 105. Many Nyāya terms, such as Tarka or reasoning (*Kaṭha Up.*, ii. 9 ; *Manu*, xii. 106 ; *M.B.*, ii. 153), Vāda or discussion (*Manu*, vi. 50 ; *Rāmāyaṇa*, i. 13–23 ; vii. 53–60), Yukti or continuous argument (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, vi. 23 ; *Rāmāyaṇa*, ii. 1. 13), Jalpa or wrangling (*M.B.*, xiii. 4322), Vitaṇḍā or cavilling (*M.B.*, ii. 1310 ; vii. 3022 ; and *Pāṇini*, iv. 4. 102), Chala or quibbling (*Manu*, viii. 49 ; *Rāmāyaṇa*, iv. 57. 10), Nirṇaya or ascertainment (*M.B.*, xiii. 7553, 7535), Prayojana or purpose (*Manu*, vii. 100 ; *M.B.*, i. 5805), Pramāṇa or proof (*Manu*, ii. 13 ; *Rāmāyaṇa*, ii. 37. 21 ; *M.B.*, xiii. 5572), Prameya, the object of knowledge (*Rāmāyaṇa*, i. 52. 13 ; *M.B.*, i. 157 ; vii. 1419), are to be met with in earlier works. See Vidyābhūṣaṇ's *History of Indian Logic*, p. 23.

[3] M.B., i. 70. 42 ; xii. 210. 22.

[4] *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*, i. 1. 1.

[5] See also *Udāna*, vi. 10.

[6] See also *Vibhaṅga*, pp. 293 ff.

[7] S.B.E., pp. 6–7.

The beginnings of the Nyāya belong to the pre-Buddhistic period, though a scientific treatment of it was undertaken some time about the period of early Buddhism, and the main principles were well established before the third century B.C. We know little about the historical development of the Nyāya prior to the composition of the Sūtra.

III

Literature and History

The history of the Nyāya literature extends over twenty centuries. The *Nyāya Sūtra* of Gautama, divided into five books, each containing two sections, forms the first textbook of the Nyāya. According to Vatsyāyana, this treatise follows the method of enunciation, definition and critical examination. The first book states in general terms the sixteen topics to be considered in the other four. The second book deals with the nature of doubt, the means of proof and their validity. The third book discusses the nature of self, body, senses, their objects, cognition and mind. The fourth treats of volition, sorrow, suffering and liberation. Incidentally, it refers to the theory of error and the relation of whole and parts. The last book discusses jāti or unreal objections and nigrahasthāna or occasions for rebuke. The *Nyāya Sūtra* attempts to combine the results of Brahmanical thought in the department of logic with their religious and philosophical dogmas; and we have, as a result, a logical defence of theistic realism. The Sūtras of Gautama, at any rate the earlier of them, belong to the third century B.C., the age of the Āhnikas, or daily lessons like the Navāhnikas of Patañjali's *Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya*, though some of the contents of the *Nyāya Sūtra* are certainly of a post-Christian era.[1]

[1] Jacobi believes that the N.S. and N.B. belong to about the same time, perhaps separated by a generation. He places them between the second century A.D., when the Śūnyavāda developed, and the fifth century A.D., when the Vijñānavāda became systematised (see J.A.O.S., xxxi. 1911, pp. 2, 13). He thinks that the Buddhist views criticised in the N.S. are those of Śūnyavāda advocated by Nāgārjuna, who is placed about the third century A.D., and not Vijñānavāda of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu, who are assigned to the middle of the fourth century A.D. It is, however, difficult to accept this view. Both Vātsyāyana and Vācaspati hold that N.S., iv. 2. 26, is directed against the Vijñānavāda. We need not deny that the Śūnyavāda is attacked in the N.S. (cp. N.S., iv. 1. 40; iv. 1. 48, with the *Mādhyamika Kārikā*, xv. 6, and vii. 20, respectively, and also N.S., iv. 1. 34–35, with Candrakīrti's *Vṛtti*, pp. 64–71). But Śūnyavāda is earlier than Nāgārjuna, who is familiar with the Nyāya terminology and denies the doctrine of atoms (cp. N.S., iv. 2. 18–24, 31–32, with the *Mādhyamika Kārikā*, vii. 34, and N.S., iii. 2. 11 and iv. 1. 64). All that we can say is that the N.S. is of an earlier date than Nāgārjuna, though later than the Mādhyamika tradition (see also *I.P.*, vol. i, p. 643 n.; Ui: *Vaiśeṣika Philosophy*, p. 85). The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* refers to Tārkikas and Naiyāyikas, and if we remember

Vātsyāyana's *Nyāya Bhāṣya* is the classic commentary on the *Nyāya Sūtra*. Evidently, Vātsyāyana is not the immediate successor of Gautama, since his work contains passages of the character of vārttikas, which state in a condensed form the results of discussions

that some of the cosmological views refuted in the N.S. are as old as early Buddhism, Jacobi's date, which is supported by Suali, who refers the N.S. to A.D. 300 or 350, seems to be much too late (see also Ui: *Vaiśeṣika Philosophy*, p. 16). Garbe inclines to the view that the N.S. belongs to the first century A.D., since they were known to Pañcaśikha, whom he believes to have been a contemporary of Śabara, who lived some time between A.D. 100 and 300. Gautama is familiar with the terminology of the B.S. (cp. N.S., iii. 2. 14–16, with B.S., ii. 1. 24) and the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā of Jaimini (see N.S., ii. 1. 61, 67; Bodas: Introduction to *Tarkasaṁgraha*). Bodas believes that the V.S., iv. 1. 4–5, have in view Bādarāyaṇa's criticism of the theory of atoms, and V.S., iii. 2. 9 (cp. also N.S, iii. 1. 28–30), is aimed at the Vedānta view that the self is known only through the śruti. Similarly, V.S., iv. 2. 2–3, controvert the view of B.S., ii. 2. 21–22, that the body is the result of the union of five or three elements. Gautama propounds views very similar to those of Bādarāyaṇa in several places. See N.S., iv. 1. 64, and iii. 2. 14–16. The absence of any direct reference to the Nyāya in the B.S. and the M.S. is sometimes emphasised. It may be that Vyāsa, reputed to be a disciple of Gautama, did not care to criticise the Nyāya view, especially as it was agreeable to the admission of Īśvara. Again, it is sometimes held that the B.S., ii. 1 11–13, attempt to disprove the Nyāya view of establishing God by reasoning. The doctrines of atomism and asatkāryavāda are examined in B.S., ii. 2. 10–16, and ii. 1. 15-20. Early Buddhist works do not contain information for assigning the date of the N.S. Kātyāyana (fourth century B.C.) and Patañjali (whose great work was written about 140 B.C.) knew the Nyāya system. See Goldstucker's *Pāṇini*. Śabara's quotations from Bhagavān Upavarṣa, who is said to have written commentaries on both the Mīmāṁsās, indicate Upavarṣa's familiarity with the Nyāya views. Harivarman (A.D. 260) knows about the sixteen topics of the Nyāya. Aśvaghoṣa uses the five-membered syllogism. See Ui: *Vaiśeṣika Philosophy*, pp. 56 and 81. We may therefore conclude that the N.S. existed in the fourth century B.C., though not in the present form. M. M. Haraprasād Śāstri says: "I am not sure if the work N.S. had not gone through several redactions before it assumed its present shape" (J.A.S. of Bengal, 1905, p. 178; see also pp. 245 ff.). Vācaspati made two attempts to collect the Sūtras in his *Nyāyasūcī* and *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, thus suggesting doubts about the authenticity of the N.S. Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇ believes that Gautama wrote only the first chapter of the work, and he was a contemporary of the Buddha, the same as the author of the *Dharma Sūtra*, who lived in Mithilā in the sixth century B.C. (see S.B.H: N.S., pp. v–viii, and Bhāndārkar Commemoration volume, pp. 161–162) He suggests that Gautama's original views are those contained in the *Caraka Saṁhitā* (Vimānasthāna, viii). The N.S. and *Caraka Saṁhitā* have much in common; but it is said, "Caraka's references to the Nyāya principles and the Vaiśeṣika categories are of little value in fixing the date of the N.S., since the work has suffered considerable re-fashioning, and its date is also uncertain" (I.L.A., p. 13).

There are doubts expressed even about Gautama's authorship of the N.S. Vātsyāyana, Uddyotakara and Mādhava credit Akṣapāda with the author-

carried on in the school of Gautama. Vātsyāyana offers different explanations of some sūtras, indicating thereby that there were earlier commentators who did not all agree on the interpretations of the sūtras.[1] Besides, Vātsyāyana refers to Gautama as a sage of the remote past, and quotes from Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* and Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*,[2] and also from the *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra*.[3] Nāgārjuna, the author of *Upāyakausalya* and *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, is certainly earlier than Vātsyāyana, who attempts to combat the views of Nāgārjuna. Dignāga criticised Vātsyāyana's interpretation from the Buddhist point of view. From all this, we may infer that Vātsyāyana lived some time before A.D. 400.[4]

---

ship of the N.S., a view which is supported by Vācaspati and Jayanta. According to *Padma Purāṇa* (Uttarakhaṇḍa, 263) and *Skanda Purāṇa* (Kālikā Khaṇḍa, xvii), Gautama is the author of the N.S., and Viśvanātha is of this opinion. Hindu tradition identifies the two and holds that Gautama is called Akṣapāda, or one who has eyes in his feet. The story runs that when Gautama was absorbed in meditation and fell into a well, God in his mercy bestowed on his feet the power of vision to prevent further mishaps. Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇ goes against a well-established tradition when he observes that "Gautama and Akṣapāda seem both to have contributed to the production of the work. The *Nyāya Sūtra* treats mainly of five subjects, viz. (1) pramāṇa, the means of right knowledge; (2) prameya, the object of right knowledge; (3) vāda, debate or discussion; (4) avayava, the members of the syllogism; and (5) anyamataparīkṣā, an examination of contemporary philosophical doctrines. The second and the third subjects, and possibly also the first subject in its crude form, ample references to which are met with in the old Brāhmanic, Buddhistic and Jaina books, were in all probability handled by Gautama, whose Ānvīkṣikīvidyā was constituted by them. The fourth and the fifth subjects, and possibly also the first subject in its systematic form, were introduced by Akṣapāda into the Ānvīkṣikī-vidyā, which in its final form was styled the N.S. Akṣapāda was therefore the real author of the N.S., which derived a considerable part of its materials from the Ānvīkṣikī-vidyā of Gautama" (*History of Indian Logic*, pp. 49–50). This view is but a conjecture which it is impossible either to defend or refute. Not only is Gautama identified with the author of the *Dharma Sūtra*, but is also regarded as the same as the sage of that name mentioned in Vālmīki's *Rāmāyana* in connection with the episode of Ahalyā. According to the M.B. (Śāntiparva, 265. 45), Medhātithi is another name for Gautama. Bhāsa, in his *Pratimānāṭaka*, refers to Medhātithi as the founder of the Nyāya system: "Mānavīyaṁ dharmaśāstram, māheśvaraṁ yogaśāstram, bārhaspatyam arthaśāstram, medhātither nyāyaśāstram" (Act V). See also *History of Indian Logic*, p. 766.

[1] See N.B., i. 1. 5, i. 2. 9. Vātsyāyana refers to other interpreters in i. 1. 32 in the usual style: eke, some; kecit, certain; anye, others. See M.B., Ādiparva, 42–44.

[2] N.B., i. 1. 1, and *Arthaśāstra*, 11; N.B., v. 1. 10, and *Mahābhāṣya*, i. 1. 3.

[3] Cp. V.S., iv. 1. 6, and N.B., iii. 1. 33, iii. 1. 67; V.S., iii. 1. 16, and N.B., ii. 2. 34.

[4] Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇ believes that Vātsyāyana was a native of South India of the middle of the fourth century A.D. (*History of India Logic*,

Dignāga's works, which are preserved in Tibetan translations, are *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, with a commentary by the author himself, *Nyāyapraveśa*, *Hetucakrahamaru*, *Ālambanaparīkṣā* and *Pramāṇaśāstrapraveśa*, and they are said to be popular in Japan.[1] Dignāga belongs to the fifth century A.D.[2] Many of the important changes introduced in logical doctrine by Praśastapāda are traced to Dignāga, whose originality will suffer a good deal, if Praśastapāda is found to be his predecessor.

Uddyotakara's *Nyāyavārttika* (sixth century A.D.)[3] is a defence of Vātsyāyana against the attacks of Dignāga. Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* is a defence of Dignāga against the criticisms of Uddyotakara. If we assume that the *Vādavidhi* referred to by Uddyotakara[4] is another name for Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya*, and that the śāstra referred to by Dharmakīrti in his *Nyāyabindu*[5] is the *Vārttika* of Uddyotakara, then these two writers may be supposed to belong to the same period. The latest date, however, for Dharmakīrti is the beginning of the seventh century.[6] In the ninth century Dharmottara followed on the lines of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti, in his *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*.

Towards the first half of the ninth century, Vācaspati re-established

pp. 42, 116–117; A., 1915, Art. on *Vātsyāyana*). While Keith (I.L.A., p. 28) and Bodas (Introduction to *Tarkasaṁgraha*) agree with this view, Jacobi and Suali are inclined to place him about the beginning of the sixth century A.D., or a little earlier. Haraprasād Śāstri makes Vātsyāyana a successor of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, since he is familiar with the Mahāyānist doctrines of momentariness, śūnyavāda, individuality, etc. See J.A.S. of Bengal, 1905, pp. 178–179.

[1] Some idea of their contents may be gathered from Vidyābhūṣan's *History of Indian Logic*, pp. 276–299, and Uddyotakara's references to Dignāga's views in his N.V.

[2] Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism* says that Dignāga was the son of a Brāhmin of Conjeevaram, who soon became proficient in the teachings of the Hīnayāna, though he later acquired from Vasubandhu Mahāyāna teachings. According to the evidence of Yuan Chwang, Vasubandhu, before he became a Buddhist, was well versed not only in the eighteen schools of Buddhism, but also in the six systems of the Hindus. Vasubandhu is now assigned to the first half of the fourth century A.D., and Dignāga may have flourished some time before A.D. 400. Kālidāsa's suggested reference to Dignāga in his *Meghadūta* confirms this view, since Kālidāsa belongs to the same period (see Keith: *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 31–32, and I.P., p. 624 n.).

[3] Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā* refers to Uddyotakara as the rescuer of the Nyāya (see Hall's edition, p. 235). Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*, written during the time of King Harṣa, who reigned in Thanesvar, at any rate during the years from A.D. 629–644, when the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang travelled through India, mentions *Vāsavadattā* (i), which refers to Uddyotakara. It is therefore safe to assume that he belonged to the sixth century A.D. Uddyotakara is a Bhāradvāja by gotra and a Pāśupata by sect.

[4] N.V., i. 33.

[5] *Nyāyabindu*, iii, Peterson's edition, pp. 110–111.

[6] I-tsing refers to him. See Takakusu: *I-tsing*, p. lviii.

the orthodox view of the Nyāya in his *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā*. He also wrote smaller works on the Nyāya like *Nyāyaṣūcīnibandha*. *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* is also attributed to him.[1] He is a versatile genius, and has written authoritative works on other systems of thought, as the *Bhāmatī* on the Advaita Vedānta and the *Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudī* on the Sāṁkhya. He is therefore styled Sarvatantrasvatantra or Ṣaḍdarśanīvallabha. Udayana's (A.D. 984) *Tātparyapariśuddhi* is a valuable commentary on Vācaspati's work. His *Ātmatattvaviveka* is a defence of the permanent soul theory and a criticism of the Buddhist thinkers Āryakīrti and others. His *Kusumāñjali* is the first systematic account of the theism of the Nyāya.[2] His other works are *Kiraṇāvali* and *Nyāyapariśiṣṭa*. Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjari* is an independent commentary on the *Nyāya Sūtra*. Jayanta, who quotes Vācaspati, and is quoted by Ratnaprabhā and Devasūri, belongs to the tenth century.[3] Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra* is, as its name implies, a survey of the Nyāya philosophy. He admits the three proofs of perception, inference and verbal testimony, and rejects comparison as an independent means of proof. He is a Śaivite, perhaps of the Kashmir sect, and belongs to the tenth century A.D. Vardhamāna's *Nyāyanibandhaprakāśa* (A.D. 1225) is a commentary on Udayana's *Nyāyatātparyapariśuddhi*, though it incorporates the views of Gaṅgeśa, the father of Vardhamāna and the founder of the modern school. Rucidatta's *Makaranda* (A.D. 1275) develops Vardhamāna's views.[4]

The later works on the Nyāya openly accept the Vaiśeṣika categories, which they bring under prameya or objects of knowledge, or under artha, which is one of the twelve kinds of prameya. Varadarāja's *Tārkikarakṣā* (twelfth century A.D.) is an important treatise of the syncretist school. He brings under prameya the twelve objects of the Nyāya as well as the six categories of the Vaiśeṣika. Keśava Miśra's *Tarkabhāṣā* (end of the thirteenth century) combines the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika views.[5]

The important Jaina logical works are Bhadrabāhu's *Daśavaikālikaniryukti* (357 B.C. *circa*), Siddhasena Divākara's *Nyāyāvatāra* (sixth

---

[1] The author of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* is different from the writer here referred to, and lived in the fifteenth century A.D. Vācaspati says that his *Nyāyasūcī* was composed in the year 898, which most probably refers to the Vikrama era and corresponds to our A.D. 841. There is no doubt that he preceded Ratnakīrti, the Buddhist logician (A.D. 1000).

[2] When he felt that God did not show any mercy towards him in consideration of his services for theism, he is reported to have addressed the Supreme in the words, "Proud of thy prowess thou despisest me upon whom thy existence depended when the Buddhists reigned supreme."

Aiśvaryamadamatto 'si māṁ avajñāya vartase
Parākrānteṣu bauddheṣu madadhīnā tava sthitiḥ.

[3] See *History of Indian Logic*, p. 147, and I.L.A., p. 33.

[4] It is a commentary on Vardhamāna's Prakāśa or Udayana's Kusumāñjali.

[5] It is translated by Dr. Jhā in *Indian Thought*, vol. ii.

century A.D.), Māṇikyanandi's *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra* (A.D. 800), Devasūri's *Pramāṇanayatattvālokālaṁkāra* (twelfth century A.D.) and Prabhācandra's *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*. The Jaina thinkers and the Buddhist logicians differentiated logical inquiries from those of religion and metaphysics, with which they were mixed up in the discussions of the Hindu writers. The Nyāya works of the latter treat of atoms and their properties, souls and rebirth, God and the world, as well as logical problems of the nature and limits of knowledge. The Buddhist and the Jaina thinkers showed no interest in the metaphysical implications of the ancient Nyāya, but laid great stress on the purely logical aspects, and thus prepared the way for the modern Nyāya, which is pure logic and dialectic.

Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi* is the standard text of the modern school.[1] Vardhamāna, the son of Gaṅgeśa, continued the tradition in his works. Jayadeva wrote a commentary on *Tattvacintāmaṇi* called the *Āloka* (thirteenth century). Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma's *Tattvacintāmaṇivyākhyā*[2] may be regarded as the first great work of the Navadvīpa (Nuddea) school, and it belongs to the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century. He was fortunate in his disciples, the chief of them being Caitanya, the famous Vaiṣṇava reformer, Raghunātha, the renowned logician and the author of *Dīdhiti* and *Padārthakhaṇḍana*,[3] Raghunandana, the famous jurist, and Kṛṣṇānanda, the great authority on Tāntrik rites. Though Gaṅgeśa wrote only on the four pramāṇas, and did not concern himself directly with the metaphysical implications, Raghunātha, like some other writers of this school, showed much interest in metaphysics also. Jagadīśa (end of the sixteenth century) and Gadādhara (seventeenth century) are well-known logicians of this school. Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa[4] (seventeenth century), a Brahmin of Andhra, tried to evolve a consistent system from out of the ancient and the modern Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, though his views leaned towards the ancient Nyāya. His *Tarkasaṁgraha* and *Dīpikā* are popular manuals of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school. Vallabha's *Nyāyalīlāvati*, Viśvanātha's *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* (seventeenth century) are other works of some importance.[5]

It is possible to distinguish different stages in the development of logical studies in India. We have first of all

[1] A summary of this work is given in Vidyābhūṣan's *History of Indian Logic*, pp. 407–453. Gaṅgeśa lived at Mithilā in the last quarter of the twelfth century, as is evident from his familiarity with Udayana's works and quotations from Śivāditya and Harṣa. In *Tattvacintāmani* (ii. p. 233) Śrī Harṣa's views are criticised.

[2] *Sārāvali* is the name of it, and I am told that the MS. of it is in the Benares Government Sanskrit College Library.

[3] This criticism of the Vaiśeṣika system is published in the *Pandit* (xxiv and xxv) under the title "Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa."

[4] *History of Indian Logic*, p. 388.

[5] For the History of Hindu logic in China and Japan, see Suguira: *Hindu Logic as Preserved in China and Japan*.

Ānvīkṣikī, which is given a separate place along with the Nyāya in the Mahābhārata. It soon becomes blended with the Nyāya, and in the classical texts of the ancient school we have in addition to logical theory a metaphysical view of the universe as a whole. As Vātsyāyana says, " The highest good is attained only when one has rightly understood the real nature of (1) that which is fit to be discarded (i.e. suffering along with its causes in the shape of avidyā and its effects), (2) that which puts an end to suffering, in other words, jñāna (knowledge), (3) the means by which the destruction of suffering is accomplished, i.e. philosophical treatises, and (4) the goal to be attained or the highest good."[1] Ancient Nyāya discussed logical questions, though not for their own sake. The contributions of the Jaina and the Buddhist thinkers bring about a change in the outlook. The modern Nyāya, with its exclusive interest in the theory of knowledge, forgets the intimate relation between logic and life. The ancient Naiyāyika had a more adequate idea of the relation of logic and metaphysics. Logic can ascertain the normative forms of thought only in relation to the content of thought. The modern Naiyāyika devotes great attention to pramāṇa or the means of knowledge and the theory of definition,[2] and discards altogether the question of prameyas or the objects of knowledge. The scholastic subtleties, the logical legerdemain, the fine hair-splitting in which the works of the successors of Gaṅgeśa indulge, terrify many, and even those who have grappled with them cannot be sure that they have comprehended their ideas. Many of those who have waded through these works are impressed by their brilliant dialectical feats, but find them often more confusing than enlightening. Plain issues are obscured by over-subtlety. The fondness of the logical mind for drawing distinctions often degenerates into a love of formulas, and leaves on the mind the impression of a formalism rather poor in content. Elaboration of terminology takes the place of inquiry into subject-matter. Terms which ought to define distinctions are sometimes employed to circumvent difficulties. Of some at least of these works it may be said that they merely succeed in showing how learned one can be

[1] N.B., i. 1. 1.

[2] Lakṣaṇapramāṇābhyāṁ vastusiddhiḥ.

about one knows not what. Even those who believe that the mill of their intellect grinds exceeding small cannot help admitting that it is not always fed with a sufficiency of grain.[1] The value of Navya Nyāya as a training-ground for the intellect can hardly be overestimated.

IV

THE SCOPE OF THE NYĀYA

The term Nyāya means literally that by means of which the mind is led to a conclusion.[2] "Nyāya" becomes equivalent to an argument, and the system which treats of arguments more thoroughly than others comes to be known as the Nyāya system. Arguments are either valid or invalid. The term "nyāya" means in popular usage right or just, and so the Nyāya becomes the science of right reasoning. "Nyāya" in the narrow sense stands for syllogistic reasoning,[3] while in the wider sense it signifies the examination of objects by evidences. It thus becomes a science of demonstration or of correct knowledge, pramāṇaśāstra. All knowledge implies four conditions: (1) The subject or the pramātṛ, the cogniser or the substantive ground of the cognitions; (2) the object, or the prameya to which the process of cognition is directed; (3) the resulting state of cognition, or the pramiti; and (4) the means of knowledge, or the pramāṇa.[4] Every cognitive act, valid or invalid, has the three factors of a cognising subject, a content or a what of which the subject is aware, and a

[1] Cp. Bodas: *Tarkasaṁgraha*, p. xiii; Keith: I.L.A., p. 35. Dr. Vidyābhuṣan divides the history of the Nyāya philosophy into three periods: Ancient (650 B.C. to A.D. 100), Mediæval (up to A.D. 1200), and Modern (from A.D. 900). See his *History of Indian Logic*, p. xiii. For an idea of the character of Modern Nyāya, see Dr. Śaileśvar Sen's *A Study of Mathurānātha's Tattva-cintāmaṇi-rahasya*, 1924.

[2] Nīyate anena iti nyāyah.

[3] N.B., i. 1. 1. Vātsyāyana uses the expression paramanyāya for the syllogism which combines in itself the five parts. Dignāga calls the members of a syllogism nyāyāvayava. See also N.V., iv. 1. 14. In Vācaspati's *Nyāyasūcī* the section on the syllogism (i. 1. 32–39) is spoken of as the Nyāyaprakaraṇa. Viśvanātha means by Nyāyasvarūpa the essential structure of the syllogism. See his *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*, i. 1. 25; i. 1. 31; i. 1. 38; i. 1. 40. Mādhava (S.D.S., xi) uses the word nyāya in the sense of inference for the sake of others.

[4] Pramākaraṇam pramāṇam. See also *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, i.

relation of knowledge between the two, which are distinguishable though not separable. The nature of knowledge, as valid or invalid, depends upon the fourth factor of pramāṇa. It is the operative cause of valid knowledge in normal circumstances.[1]

While Vātsyāyana defines pramāṇa as an instrument of knowledge or "that by which the knowing subject knows the object,"[2] Uddyotakara calls it the cause of knowledge (upalabdhihetu).[3] He admits that this definition is rather wide, since the cogniser and the object cognised are also causes of cognition, but justifies it on the ground that "The cogniser and the cognised have their function fulfilled elsewhere, i.e. the function of the cognising subject and the cognised object lies in, and is only fulfilled by the inciting of the pramāṇa into activity; pramāṇa, on the other hand, does not have its function fulfilled (except by the bringing about of the cognition); so it is the pramāṇa that is to be regarded as the real cause of the cognition." Wherever the pramāṇa is present, cognition arises; wherever it is absent, whatever else may be present, cognition does not arise. Pramāṇa is thus the most efficient cause of cognition and the last to appear before the cognition arises.[4] Śivāditya brings out the logical implication when he defines pramāṇa as that which produces pramā or knowledge in accord with reality.[5] Jayanta makes pramāṇa the cause which produces non-erroneous, certain knowledge of objects.[6]

The specific form of knowledge depends on the pramāṇa. The other factors of subject and object may be the same in perception or inference. Similarly, the contact of the manas with the soul is the common mediate cause of all forms of knowledge. Only contact (saṁyoga) takes different forms in the different kinds of knowledge. Though the Nyāya deals with know-

[1] N.V., i. 1. 1.

[2] N B., i. 1. 1.

[3] See also N.V.T.T., i. 1. 1.

[4] N.V., i. 1. 1. Another objection, viz., that if the pramāṇa is brought into existence by the cognising subject and the cognised object, then these two must exist prior to the pramāṇa, though as a matter of fact, until the pramāṇa is there, we cannot recognise subject or object, which have a meaning only in relation to the thought activity called the pramāṇa, is considered. Uddyotakara admits all this, but says: "These words are not dependent on their relation to present action only." A cook is a cook whether he is actually cooking or not. "The reason for such usage lies in the (expressive) potency of the word itself; and this potency is present at all times; in the same manner, there need be no incongruity in the assertion that the pramāṇa is brought into existence by the cognising subject and the cognised object."

[5] *Saptapadārthī*, sec. 144. See also S.D.S., xi.

[6] Avyabhicāriṇīm asaṁdigdhām arthopalabdhim. *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 12.

ledge, it deals more especially with the supreme condition of knowledge called the pramāṇa,and so it is called pramāṇaśāstra.[1] Before we investigate the nature of objects, we must know the capacity of the instruments of knowledge; for "knowledge of the thing to be measured depends on the knowledge of the measure."[2] Pramāṇaśāstra not only helps us to a right apprehension of objects, but also enables us to test the validity of knowledge.[3] It is both formal and material, and is interested in consistency as well as in truth. The Nyāya starts with the assumption that the account of the world which our minds afford us is in the main a trustworthy account. All knowledge is revelatory of reality (arthaprakāśa). We are so constituted as to perceive objects, notice their resemblances and draw inferences. These operations are performed by all thinking men, though with different degrees of care and exactness. Whenever we have mental activity, controlled by the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of reality, we have a topic for logical inquiry. Truth-seeking is already present in human action. Logical theory does not create it. It only tries to interpret this element and express its nature in general principles. Its problem is not much different from that of any positive science. Just as a physiologist investigates the processes by which life is sustained in the individual, the logician states the laws governing the process of knowledge. He is no more responsible for it than the physiologist is for the working of the bodily mechanism.

The Nyāya system does not assume that value and fact are wholly disparate and require altogether different methods of treatment. Values attach to facts and can be studied only in relation to them. We do not start with empty minds; we possess information about the nature of the world through experience and tradition. A complex system of knowledge is handed down through the scriptures. Adopting the inductive method of science, the Nyāya classifies the different ways in which our knowledge is acquired. The four pramāṇas through

[1] The importance attached by the Hindu thinkers to the investigation of pramāṇas is evident from Viśvanātha's reference that pramāṇa is one of the names of Viṣṇu.

[2] Mānādhīnā meyasiddhiḥ. Citsukhī, ii. 18.

[3] Cp. W. E. Johnson's definition of logic as "the analysis and criticism of thought" (*Logic*, vol. i, p. xiii).

which correct knowledge is acquired are pratyakṣa or intuition,[1] anumāna or inference,[2] upamāna or comparison and śabda or verbal testimony.[3] Western treatises on logic do not generally treat of perception,[4] but the Nyāya regards it as one of the important sources of knowledge. Inference is a central topic of the Nyāya system, which is sometimes called Hetuvidyā, or the science of reason on which the validity of an inferential argument depends.[5] According to this view logic is the theory of inference or anumānavāda. Intuitive or immediate knowledge is beyond the scope of logic as thus understood. The Nyāya does not justify this narrow usage. The inclusion of verbal testimony, which covers the problem of Revealed Theology, shows the religious interest of the system. The Nyāya gives us a psychological account of these four sources of knowledge. It affirms that logical inquiry cannot be carried on without regard to the psychological processes by which knowledge as mental content is gained. It treats at length the ways by which the mind is carried forward and impelled to produce fresh results. In doing so, it also points out the pitfalls which are incidental to the employment of these means. The problem of logic is not a purely inductive one. The mere generalisation, that all our knowledge is gained through one or other of the four sources of knowledge, does not explain the problem of knowledge. Generalisation is not explanation.

The Nyāya not only inquires into the ways and means by which the human mind assimilates and develops knowledge, it also interprets the logical facts and expresses them in logical formulas which assume the form of standards or norms in all cases of the divergence of thought from its normal course of truth-seeking. Pramāṇas thus become the measures or canons

[1] Sense-perception is only a variety of intuition or direct apprehension.

[2] Anumāna means literally the knowledge of one thing after, or through that of, another.

[3] N.S., i. 1. 3. Caraka gives āptopadeśa or reliable assertion, pratyakṣa, anumāna and yukti or continuous reasoning. See also *Sthānāṅga Sūtra*.

[4] Cp., however, J. S. Mill: "Truth is known to us in two ways, intuition and inference" (*System of Logic*, Introduction, p. 4).

[5] The term "hetuvidyā" occurs in *Milinda* (S.B.E., vol. xxxv, pp. 6–7), *Lalitavistara* (xii). Though "hetu" means only reason or ground, the Jaina thinkers use it in a wider sense. See also *Manu*, ii. 11; M.B., Ādiparva, 1–67; Śāntiparva, 210. 22; Aśvamedhaparva, 85. 27. The earlier grammarians, Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali accept this view. See also N.V., iv 1. 14; I.L.A., p. 11.

of knowledge by means of which we can check and evaluate the knowledge already existing in us. Logic is thus the science of proof or the estimation of evidence. It discusses the validity of knowledge by showing its dependence on given grounds or compatibility with reality. The problem of truth has important bearings on metaphysical theory. The Nyāya is a metaphysics of reality (tattvaśāstra),[1] as well as a theory of knowledge. Thus it is not merely formal logic but a full epistemology, combining discussions of psychology and logic, metaphysics and theology.

THE NATURE OF DEFINITION

The several topics discussed in the *Nyāya Sūtra* are first enunciated, then defined, and lastly examined.[2] Definition states the essential nature (svarūpa) of a thing so as to differentiate it from others. The function of a definition is to distinguish the thing defined from all things different from itself, with which it is likely to be confused.[3] We can distinguish things without stating their respective essences. An asādhāraṇa dharma or a peculiar attribute also helps us to distinguish. The fallacies incident to definition are of three kinds: Ativyāpti, or the extension of the attribute to objects beyond the class defined, occurs in definitions which are too wide, as when we define a cow as a horned animal; Avyāpti, or limitation of the attributes to only a portion of the class defined, which occurs in definitions which are too narrow, as when we define a cow as a tawny animal; Asambhava, or the fallacy committed when the definition states an attribute which is not found in any of the objects defined, as when we define a cow as an animal with uncloven hoofs. Definition states " a characteristic mark which applies to all things denoted by the term defined, neither more nor less." [4] To secure this, we may start with the genus and subsequently narrow its denotation by the express exclusion of superfluous objects, by

[1] N.B., i. 1. 1.
[2] Uddeśa, lakṣaṇa and parīkṣā, N.B., i. 1. 3.
[3] N.B., i. 1. 3.
[4] Lakṣyatāvacchedakasamaniyatatvam.

the use of words like other than (itara), different from (bhinna).[1] This is definition by genus and difference.

VI

Pratyakṣa or Intuition

Of the different sources of knowledge, pratyakṣa or intuition is the most important. Vātsyāyana says, " when a man seeks the knowledge of a certain thing, if he is told of it by a trustworthy person and has the verbal cognition of the thing, there is still a desire in his mind to ratify his information by means of inference through particular indicative features; and even after he has been able to get at the inferential knowledge of the thing, he is still desirous of actually seeing the thing with his eyes; but when he has once perceived the thing directly, his desires are at rest and he does not seek for any other kind of knowledge." [2] The word " pratyakṣa " is ambiguous, as it is used for both the result, the apprehension of the truth and the process or the operation which leads to that result. Though " pratyakṣa " originally meant sense-perception, it soon came to cover all immediate apprehension whether through the aid of the senses or not.[3] Gaṅgeśa defines pratyakṣa as direct apprehension.[4] It is knowledge whose instrumental cause is not knowledge.[5] In inference, comparison and verbal testimony, we have as our data knowledge of premises or of similarity or of convention. In memory

[1] Cp. the definition of earth as jalādy aṣṭadravya bhinnam dravyam pṛthivī.

[2] N.B., i. 1. 3. It is clear that one and the same object may be cognised by more than one pramāṇa. The existence of the soul may be known from scripture, inference or mental perception. The existence of fire may be known through information conveyed by another or actual perception or inference. There are also cases where only one pramāṇa can function. That the performance of the agnihotra ceremony leads to heaven is known only through scriptural evidence. Uddyotakara holds that " when the same object is cognised through different pramāṇas it is cognised in its different aspects " (N.V., Introduction).

[3] *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, p. 7; I.P., pp. 295–296.

[4] Pratyakṣasya sākṣātkāritvaṁ lakṣaṇam. *Tattvacintamaṇi*, p. 552.

[5] Jñānākaraṇakaṁ jñānaṁ pratyakṣam. Cp. McTaggart: " A belief which is directly based on a perception . . . is properly called ultimate, since, although it is based on something—the perception—it is not based on any other *belief* " (*The Nature of Existence*, pp. 42–43).

we have knowledge of what we have previously apprehended. In pratyakṣa, knowledge is not an antecedent condition. God's knowledge is direct, immediate and entire, and is not instrumented by any other cognition.

Gautama defines sense-perception as "that knowledge which arises from the 'contact' of a sense-organ with its object, inexpressible by words, unerring and well defined."[1] This definition mentions the different factors involved in the act of perception: (1) the senses (indriyas), (2) their objects (artha), (3) the contact of the senses with their objects (sannikarṣa), and (4) cognition produced by this contact (jñānam). It is a matter of inference that there are sense-organs. The cognition of colour is not possible, if there is not a visual organ.[2] The senses are said to be five, corresponding to the five characters of knowledge (buddhilakṣaṇa) visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory and tactual.[3] They occupy different sites (adhisṭhāna), the eyeball, the earhole, the nose, the tongue and the skin. From the varied nature of the processes (gati), forms (ākṛti) and constituents (jāti), of which they are made, it is evident that the senses are five in number. The five sense-organs, eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin, are said to be of the same nature as the five elements, light, ether, earth, water and air, whose special qualities of colour, sound, smell, taste and tangibility are manifested by them.[4]

A view similar to that of Democritus, that all the senses are only modifications of touch,[5] is refuted on the ground that a blind man

[1] i. 1. 4. Cp. Caraka's definition of perception as the knowledge which is produced by a union of the soul with the mind (manas), the senses and their objects. Gaṅgeśa criticises Gautama's definition on several grounds; it is too wide, since every cognition is produced by the contact of the object with the manas, which is also a sense. Again, it does not apply to the intuitive apprehension of all things that God has without any sense-mediation. What is a sense organ can be determined only by perception, and the use of the term sense in the definition involves the fallacy of circular reasoning.

[2] Since the senses consist of elements endowed with special qualities, they are able to perceive their respective objects and not themselves. An eye sees an external object, but not itself The only exception is sound (N.S., iii. 1. 68–69, 71).

[3] N.S., iii. 1. 54.

[4] Nothing can offer resistance to a non-material all-pervading substance. Since the eye receives obstruction from material things like walls, it is itself material.

[5] This view is attributed to the Sāṁkhya by *Ratnaprabhā* and *Bhāmatī* (ii. 2. 10).

cannot see colour.[1] If the special parts of touch partake of the nature of the senses, then the senses are many; if they do not, then we have to admit that colour, sound and the like are not cognisable by the senses.[2] If there is only one sense, the different functions of seeing, hearing, smelling can be produced simultaneously. Besides, touch can perceive only objects which are near, whereas sight and sound perceive objects which are far off. While the Nyāya rejects the theory of the unity of sense-organs, it recognises the distinctive character of tvak or touch. Relative consciousness is possible only when there is contact between manas and tvak, and when manas happens to be within the purītat, beyond the sphere of tvak, as it is in suṣupti or dreamless sleep, there is abeyance of conscious life altogether.[3]

Manas (or mind) is a condition of perception. When we are deeply absorbed in some study we do not hear the sound of the wind, though the sound affects the organ of hearing and the self is in connection with it, being all-pervading. Again, "even when the contact of more than one sense-organ with their respective objects is present, there is no simultaneous perception of all these objects—which is due to the fact that while there is proximity or contact of the manas (with one object) there is no such contact of it (with the other objects), which shows that the operation of the manas is necessary in every act of perception."[4] Manas mediates between the self and the senses. It accounts for the non-simultaneity of the acts of knowledge.[5] The quick succession of impressions gives sometimes the appearance of simultaneity. When we run a pin through a number of sheets we imagine that the piercing is simultaneous, while it is really successive.[6] It follows that if the manas is in contact with one sense-organ, it cannot be so with another. It is therefore said to be atomic in dimension. If the manas were all-pervading (vibhu), then we cannot account for the successive character of our sense-experiences. As soon as the sense is in contact with the object, the manas comes with lightning speed to reach the sense. Besides, contact between two all-pervading substances is inconceivable. "Remembrance, inference, verbal cognition, doubt, intuition

[1] N.S., iii. 1. 51–52.
[2] See N.S., iii. 1. 53.
[3] See Brh. Up., iv 1. 19; *Tarkasaṁgrahadīpikā*, 18.
[4] N.B., i. 1. 4.
[5] i. 1. 16; ii. 1. 24; iii. 2. 6–7; N.V., i. 1. 16.
[6] N.B., iii 2. 58.

(pratibhā), dream, imagination (ūha), as also perception of pleasure and the rest are indicative of the existence of manas." [1] The cognitions which the soul has, except anuvyavasāya, are not self-luminous.[2] We become aware of them as we become aware of feelings and desires through the manas.

Vātṣyāyana includes manas under the senses. He calls it the inner sense by which we apprehend the inner states of feelings, desires and cognitions. While the sun in the sky and the inkstand on the table are experienced immediately as belonging to a world other than myself, feelings of pleasure and pain, emotions of joy and sorrow, and acts of wishing and desiring are experienced immediately as qualities of the soul. The self perceives the inner states through the instrumentality of the manas, while the co-operation of the senses is necessary for the apprehension of outer non-subjective states.[3] The distinction between inner and outer is not coincident with that between subjective and objective, since the desire to write on paper is as much an object of direct apprehension as the paper itself. The relation of knowledge is exactly the same whether the object is an external one like the paper or an internal one like desire. The object is as directly and immediately known in the one case as in the other.[4]

Vātsyāyana holds that manas is as good a sense-organ as the eye and the like, though there are certain marked differences. The outer senses are composed of material or elemental substances, are effective on only a few specific objects, and are capable of acting as organs

[1] N.B., i. 1. 16.

[2] Even the Naiyāyikas regard anuvyavasāya as self-luminous.

[3] Cp. with this Locke's distinction between sensation and reflection, the outer sense which gives us knowledge of the external world and the inner sense which gives us knowledge of the activity of our own minds (*Essay on the Human Understanding*, ii. 1. 4). Uddyotakara makes a distinction between pleasure and the cognition of pleasure. Pleasure is the object perceived, and the cognition of pleasure arises when the manas is brought into contact with the feeling. The agreeable feeling of coolness is produced by the contact of the skin with the cool wind, and when the manas comes into contact with it the cognition of agreeableness arises.

[4] Manas, however, cannot be regarded as the instrument of its own cognition. When the cognition of non-simultaneity, which indicates the existence of manas, is brought about by means of the manas, the cognition of manas thus obtained is due to the presence of the manas. It is not a case of manas operating on itself, for manas is not the instrument in the existence or cognition of itself. In the cognition of manas, the instrument consists of the manas along with the cognition of its indicative. The manas thus qualified is not the manas by itself. See N.V.T.T., iii. 1. 17. Uddyotakara holds that manas can be directly perceived through yogic practices (N.V., iii. 1. 17).

only, as endowed with specific qualities which they apprehend, whereas manas is immaterial, effective on all objects, and is capable of acting as an organ, without being endowed with any specific quality.[1] Uddyotakara does not altogether support this view. The question of materiality or its opposite applies only to produced things, while manas is not a product at all. He admits that manas operates on all things while the senses function only in limited areas. Manas, according to this writer, resembles the self in being the substratum of the contact which is the cause of remembrance, as also of that contact which brings about the cognition of pleasure.[2] Each self has its own manas, which is eternal, though subtle and devoid of magnitude. The manas in each self is one and not many, for if there were many in a single self, there would be simultaneous appearance of many cognitions, many desires in the same self, which is not the case.[3]

Since perception is a kind of knowledge or jñana, it belongs to the self. Though the contact between the self and the manas is eternal in a certain sense, it may be said to be renewed with each fresh mental act. The Nyāya assumes a naturalistic relation between the self and the object. The outward object is conceived as making an impression on the self, even as the seal does on the wax. The Nyāya theory of perception does not solve the central problem of physiological psychology as to how the stimulus of an external object on the sense-organ which is resolved into a form of mechanical contact becomes transformed into a psychical state. Even to-day the problem remains a mystery, in spite of the great advance of scientific knowledge.

For a perception to arise there must be objects external to the percipient. By this realistic assumption, the Nyāya is saved from subjectivism, which holds that we have only momentary feelings and that the belief in external reality is the fancy of the unlearned. The contact of sense with its appropriate object leads to the direct presentation of that object to consciousness. The relation between the object which is the stimulus and the conscious effect which is the perception is studied and suggestions of *minima sensibilia*, etc., are not wanting, though accurate results on these questions were not possible in the absence of fine apparatus.

The definition of perception assumes the contact of self and manas which is present in all cognitions and the contact

[1] N.B., i. 1. 4. [2] N.V., i. 1 4. [3] N.V., iii. 2. 56.

of manas and the senses, and specifies " sense-object contact " as its distinguishing feature.[1] Perception follows upon or accompanies the modification of the self produced by the contact of the senses with their objects. " If the sense-organs were operative without actually getting at the objects, then they could perceive things behind the wall also," [2] which is not normally the case. Sannikarṣa does not mean, according to Uddyotakara, conjunction, but only " becoming " an object of sense or standing in a definite relation to the sense-organ.

Objects are of different kinds. A blade of grass is a substance, its greenness is a quality, and since qualities inhere in substances, they cannot be perceived apart from the latter.[3] Substances and qualities as genera do not have independent existence, and are perceived only through the perception of their substrata. The contact between a sense-organ and a substance is one of conjunction or saṁyoga, while the relation between a substance and its quality or genus and individual is one of inherence or samavāya. The eye, for example, comes directly into conjunction with substance, but only " indirectly " with colour which inheres in that substance, and still more " indirectly " with the class concept which inheres in colour which resides in the object with which the eye is in conjunction.

The sense-object contact is said to be of six different kinds. The first is mere conjunction (saṁyoga), as when we perceive a substance jar. The second is inherence in that which is in conjunction (saṁyukta-samavāya), as when we perceive the quality or the genus of a substance, as the colour of the jar. The third is inherence in that which inheres in that which is in conjunction (saṁyukta-samaveta-samavāya), as when we perceive the genus of the quality of a substance or the genus of the colour of the jar. The fourth is inherence (samavāya), as when we cognise the quality of sound where the relation between the ear and the sound is one of inherence.[4] The fifth is inherence in that which inheres (samavetasamavāya), as when we cognise the genus of a quality independent of the substance, as the genus of the quality of sound. The last is (viśeṣaṇatā), or the relation of the qualification

[1] ii. 1. 29

[2] *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 23; N.B., ii. 1. 19.

[3] Except in the case of sound, which, though a quality, is perceived by itself.

[4] The organ of hearing is the ākāśa confined within the cavity of the ear, and śabda or sound is the property of ākāśa

and the qualified. When we perceive the absence of the jar we have an illustration of this, since there is union of our eye with the floor in which abides the qualification of the non-existence of the jar. The contact may be expressed in two forms, either as " the ground is qualified by the absence of the jar " (ghaṭābhāvavad bhūtalam), the ground serving as the subject and the absence of the jar as the qualification, or as, " there is the absence of a jar on the ground " (bhūtale ghaṭābhāvo'sti), in which case the relations are reversed. In the first case, the negation forms the qualification of that which is in contact (saṁyukta-viśeṣaṇatā), namely, the ground with the eye; in the second case, the negation is to be qualified by that which is in contact (saṁyukta-viśeṣyatā).[1] These distinctions are based on the metaphysical assumptions of the Nyāya regarding the nature of reality, that things, qualities and relations belong to the object-world. The Nyāya assumes, with the Vaiśeṣika, that there are substances, qualities, actions, generality, particularity, inherence and non-existence. A substance having magnitude is perceived by sight provided it has manifest colour.[2] The form of contact is conjunction, the eye and the object are said to come into actual contact. According to modern Nyāya, touch also apprehends substances, if the latter are tangible. Qualities and motion are perceived by the second form of contact. Generality is perceived by the second or the third kind, according as it is the generality of substance, quality or motion. The Nyāya holds that samavāya or inherence is itself a matter of perception, while the Vaiśeṣika regards it as an object of inherence. Non-existence is covered by the sixth mode.

Kumārila and the followers of the Vedānta adopt the view that non-cognition (anupalabdhi) is an independent means of knowledge. According to Kumārila, when we apprehend the non-existence of the jar, we have two different cognitions, a positive of the ground and a negative of the absence of the jar. The Naiyāyika believes that the non-existence of the jar qualifies the vacant ground, and the ground thus qualified is perceived. If it is said that we can perceive only things which are in contact with sense-organs and there can be no contact between the absence of things and the sense-organs, the Naiyāyika replies, that the critics wrongly assume that conjunction and inherence are the only relations. Neither of them is possible in the case of non-existence, since conjunction holds good only between two substances, and non-existence is not a substance, and inherence is not possible, since non-existence is not inseparably related with anything.[3]

[1] Keith: I.L.A., p. 77.

[2] V.S., iv. 1. 6.

[3] The Nyāya view of the relation of the qualification and the qualified is criticised on the ground that it is not strictly a relation, since it is not one subsisting in two things distinct from itself. A relation is distinct from the two things related, and one only while subsisting in both of them. Conjunction is different from the drum and the stick, and is one as sub-

According to the Buddhists, the perception of negation does not mean the existence of negation, but only the existence of "*something*" which is the basis of negation. The positive perception of the ground without the jar is confused with the perception of the negation of the jar. But the Nyāya holds that the perception of positive existents is as much a fact as the perception of the negative ones. If it is said that the non-perception of the jar on the ground is the perception of the ground without the jar, the question may be asked, is this being without the jar identical with the ground or different from it? The two cannot be identical. If there is a difference between the ground with the jar and the ground without it, one is apprehended by perception as much as the other.[1]

The Buddhist logicians make out that the visual and the auditory organs do not come into direct contact with their objects, but apprehend objects at a distance as well. They are capable of apprehending objects without coming into contact with them (aprāpyakāri). The Naiyāyika argues that the visual organ is not the eyeball or the pupil of the eye, which is only the seat (adhiṣṭhāna) of the visual organ, which is of the nature of light (tejas), and the ray of light goes out of the pupil to the object at a distance and comes into direct contact with it. That is why we have a direct visual perception of direction, distance and position.[2]

sisting in both of them. The relation between the qualification and the qualified is not of this character. In the case of a man carrying a stick, the character of qualification belonging to the stick is not distinct from itself, nor is the qualifiedness of the man distinct from the man. The qualification and the qualified are identical with the things themselves. In the case of non-existence, it must be both the qualification and the qualified, since it is not possible for any substance, quality or action to subsist in non-existence. So the character of a qualification as belonging to non-existence must consist in its own form as capable of bringing about a cognition tainted with itself. So it is said that non-existence which is incapable of any relation cannot be perceived by the senses. Gangeśa adopts the view that the same instrument helps us to perceive the object as well as its absence. Non-existence is not the result of inference from non-perception, but is an object of perception.

[1] *Nyāyabindu*, p. 11, and *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 53–57.

[2] N.V., i. 1. 4. An interesting question about the visual organ, whether it is single or double, is considered. Vātsyāyana assumes that the organs are two, and when we see a thing first with one eye and then with the other we have recognition of the thing as being the same as that seen on a previous occasion, which only shows that there is a common perceiver. Uddyotakara does not accept this view (see N.B. and N.V. on iii. 1. 7, 11). Descartes was much exercised with the problem how and why two separate impressions such as are given by our two eyes or our two ears unite to give a single sensation to the mind. He thought it was accounted for by the single narrow passage at the pineal gland which gave the movements in the animal spirits admission to the brain. The rays do not possess the quality of obviousness, since, on that view, they would have obstructed our vision by standing as a screen between the eye and their object. Though unperceived, the rays of the eye reach the object through the aid of external light (see N.B., iii. 1. 38–49).

The Buddhist logician objects to the Nyāya view on the following grounds: (1) The visual organ is the pupil of the eye through which we see the objects, and the pupil cannot go out of itself and come into contact with the object at a distance. (2) The visual organ apprehends objects much larger than itself, like mountains, etc., which it cannot do if it were to come into direct contact with the objects to apprehend them. (3) The fact that the visual organ takes the same time to apprehend the top of a tree or the moon, shows that the eye need not go out to the object. (4) The eye cannot go out to its object, since then it would not be able to apprehend objects behind glass, mica and the like. The visual perception of distance and direction is not direct but acquired.[1] Udayana in his *Kiraṇāvali*[2] attempts to answer these objections. (1) Whatever apprehends or manifests an object must come into contact with it. A lamp illuminates an object with which it comes into contact. So also the visual organ, which is of the nature of light, goes out of the pupil to reach the object. (2) The light issuing out of the pupil spreads out and covers the object and it becomes coextensive with the field of vision. (3) There is a difference in the time intervals required in the apprehension of near and distant objects, though it is not felt by us. The distant moon is seen on opening the eye, since the motion of light is inconceivably swift. The suggestion that the light of the eye issuing out of the pupil becomes blended with the external light and comes into contact with near and distant objects simultaneously is set aside on the ground that on such a theory we must be able to apprehend objects hidden from our view, even those at our back. (4) Glass, mica and the like are transparent in nature, and so do not obstruct the passage of light. The Pūrva Mīmāṁsā supports the Nyāya view that all sense-organs are prāpyakāri, i.e. come into contact with objects they apprehend. In the case of auditory perception, the sound that starts at a certain place travels through air by a series of sound-waves, and the auditory sense and last sound meet. Sound is propagated from its original source in a series comparable to the motion of waves or the shooting out of the filaments in all directions from the plant.[3] We get the sense of direction from the sound since the diversity of the sources qualifies the sound and particular parts of the auditory organ are roused to action. In the case of smell, small particles of the object are carried by the air to the nose. Mere contact of object with sense is enough to provoke perception, as when a sleeping person hears the thunderclap.[4]

---

[1] N.V., i. 1. 4.; see also Vivaranaprameyasaṁgraha, pp. 187 ff.

[2] Bibl. Ind. ed., pp. 286 ff.

[3] See *Vivṛti* of Jayanārāyaṇa, ii. 2. 37. Kumārila disputes this view on the ground that, since the ākāśa is one and invisible, all ears should be equally affected and every sound heard by all; or again, if one is deaf, all should be deaf. Again, sounds travelling with the wind are heard at a greater distance than those travelling against it, which cannot be accounted for, as the propagation of waves takes place in ākāśa which is unaffected by sound.

[4] N.B., ii. 1. 26. It is involuntary, as it is not due to the effort (prayatna) of the self, and so is traced to adṛṣṭa or unseen destiny (N.B., ii. 1. 29).

The first characteristic of the nature of perceptual knowledge mentioned by Gautama is that it is inexpressible (avyapadeśyam). A thing is not necessarily perceived as bearing a name. The name has value for social intercourse, but is not necessarily operative at the time when the object is perceived. According to a famous teacher mentioned by Jayanta, perception excludes all cognitions of things where names enter as integral factors. If a man sees a fruit and experiences its nature, it is a perception; but if he hears from somebody its name as jack-fruit, then it is not perception but verbal cognition.[1] Vātsyāyana holds that an object may be perceived with or without the apprehension of its name. In the former case we have determinate perception, in the latter indeterminate perception.[2] The distinction between inexpressible (avyapadeśya) and well defined (vyavasāyātmaka) is equated with indeterminate (nirvikalpaka) and determinate (savikalpaka).

Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara do not refer to this distinction, and Vācaspati, who mentions it, attributes it to his teacher Trilocana.[3] All the later logicians, such as Bhāsarvajña, Keśava Miśra, Annaṁ

[1] The Śābdikas hold that the object of all perception is the word denoting the object (vāgrūpaṁ tattvam). Jayanta criticises this (*Nyāyamañjari*, p. 99), and Vācaspati asks, if objects are identical with names, are they identical with eternal sounds or conventional sounds? Perceived objects cannot be identical with unperceived sounds; nor are they identical with names, since children perceive objects without knowing their names. So those who do not know the meanings of words have indeterminate perceptions, and even those who know them have first indeterminate perception, which revives the subconscious impression of the name perceived in the past, and then the indeterminate perception becomes determinate (N.V.T.T., i. 1. 4).

[2] N.B., i. 1. 4. See also *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 99. Jayanta says that indeterminate perception cannot apprehend the word or name denoting the object. The word is not an object of visual perception, and there can be no comprehension of the word if the relation between the sign and the thing signified is not apprehended and the residual trace is not revived. Determinate perception is mixed up with verbal images, while indeterminate perception is not, and in the matter of the apprehension of generality, quality, etc., there is no difference between the two. Bhartṛhari believes that there can be no thought without language, and so indeterminate perception, which is supposed to be independent of all language, is for him an impossibility (N.V.T.T., i. 1. 4).

[3] Ratnakīrti refers to this writer in his *Apohasiddhi* and *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi*. See *Six Buddhist Nyāya Tracts*, edited by M. M. Haraprasād Śāstri. Viśvanātha mentions the distinction of indeterminate and determinate as an alternative explanation. See his *N.S. Vṛtti*, i. 1. 4.

Bhaṭṭa, and the followers of the Sāṁkhya and the Vaiśeṣika and Kumārila accept it. Gautama's definition seems to regard all perceptual knowledge as determinate. If we are in doubt whether the object at a distance is a man or a post, dust or smoke, we do not have perception. The Jainas, who hold that in all perception we are conscious of the subject which perceives as well as the object that is perceived, deny the possibility of indeterminate perception.

Savikalpaka or determinate perception implies a knowledge of the genus to which the perceived object belongs, of the specific qualities which distinguish the individual object from the other members of the same class and of the union of the two. This distinct knowledge of the genus, the differentia and their union, is absent in indeterminate perception.[1] The distinction between indeterminate and determinate perception answers roughly to that between acquaintance with and knowledge about an object, simple apprehension and perceptual judgment.

According to the earlier Vaiśeṣikas, indeterminate perception is an immediate cognition of the generic and specific characters of its object without a knowledge of the difference between them. In determinate perception the distinction between the two sets of properties is apprehended and the object is perceived as belonging to a determinate class.[2] Vācaspati thinks that in indeterminate perception we perceive the properties of the object, though we do not relate them with the object in the subject-predicate relation (viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣyabhāva), which we do in determinate perception. Śrīdhara is of this opinion. Prabhākara agrees with the earlier Vaiśeṣikas, who hold that in indeterminate perception we apprehend the mere form of the object (svarūpamātra). Though we perceive the generic and the specific features, there is no discriminative apprehension of the two, as we have in determinate perception. Gaṅgeśa defines indeterminate perception as that of an object and its generic nature as unrelated to each other. Immediately after the contact of an object with the sense-organ, say a jar with the eye, the jar is not perceived as belonging to the class of jars.[3] When the relation between the object and the class to which it belongs is also apprehended, we have determinate

---

[1] According to the *Tarkabhāṣā*, in indeterminate perception, though the self is in contact with the manas, manas with the sense, and the sense with the object, still the last factor of the object is secondary, while it becomes primary in the case of determinate perception.

[2] *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 190. Prabhākara and Pārthasārathi Miśra, who hold that determinate perception is a complex of sense-presentation and memory image, support this view.

[3] Prathamato ghaṭaghaṭatvayor viśiṣṭānavagāhy eva jñānaṁ jāyate, tad eva nirvikalpam. See *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, p. 58.

perception. Indeterminate perception, according to Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa, is the perception of an object without its qualifications, while determinate perception comprehends the relation of the qualified and the qualifications such as name and class.[1]

This analysis of determinate perception brings out the elements of conception and judgment involved in the act of perception. The fallacy of the psychical staircase theory, that we have first perception, then conception and then judgment, is avoided.

A different view of indeterminate perception, which is rather unsatisfactory, makes itself felt in the later Nyāya. It is said that what is present to consciousness is determinate perception, from which we infer the existence of the indeterminate. The determinate perception of an object as qualified by some properties presupposes an indeterminate perception of the properties, without which determinate perception is not possible. If the perception of the properties were also determinate, then it would imply the perception of the properties of the properties and so on *ad infinitum.* To avoid it we assume indeterminate perception.[2]

Some Naiyāyikas do not regard indeterminate perception as a matter of inference, but look upon it as a state of consciousness, which gives us mere existence.[3] Those who regard it as a fact of consciousness mean by it vague apprehension, while those who take it as an

---

[1] He also makes indeterminate perception niṣprakārakam, while determinate perception is saprakārakam, where prakāratā means the property of a particular cognition, which distinguishes it as the cognition of a particular object from other cognitions.

[2] I.L.A., pp. 72–73. Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa, in *Dīpikā* (42), says: " Viśiṣṭajñānam viśeṣaṇajñānajanyam, viśiṣṭajñānatvāt, daṇḍīti jñānavat. Viśeṣaṇajñānasyāpi, savikalpakatve, anavasthāprasaṅgān nirvikalpakasiddhiḥ." See also *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, 58. Viśiṣṭajñāna is judgment or knowledge of a subject (viśeṣya) as qualified by an attribute (viśeṣaṇa). The Nyāya holds that for such knowledge (ghaṭo 'yam) we require not only contact of the sense-organ with the viśeṣya (ghaṭa) jar, but also a previous knowledge of the viśeṣaṇa or jarness (ghaṭatva). This previous knowledge is technically called nirvikalpaka or indeterminate, and is inferred and not directly known (atīndriyam). The Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and the Vedānta deny the necessity of a previous knowledge of the attribute, and hold that the senses come into contact with both the attribute and its subject. This view that we have indeterminate knowledge of the mere jarness first is not supported by psychology. Universal ideas are not the first to appear in consciousness. Knowledge progresses from the indefinite to the definite. The concept of jar is logically and not chronologically prior to the perceptive judgment.

[4] Vastusvarūpamātra: *Nyāyasāra*, pp. 3, 4, 84–86.

abstraction from determinate consciousness equate it with the awareness of abstract qualities, which is, however, called indeterminate, since there is not self-appropriation (anuvyavasāya).

The main tendency, however, of the Nyāya is to regard indeterminate perception as the starting-point of all knowledge, though it is not itself knowledge. It is immediate apprehension of an object which is not in the strict sense cognitive. It is a state of undifferentiated, non-relational consciousness, free from the work of assimilation and discrimination, analysis and synthesis. It may be regarded as dumb and inarticulate and free from verbal images. Determinate perception is a mediate, differentiated, relational mode of consciousness involving the results of assimilation and discrimination. It is articulate, concrete and determinate. In indeterminate perception, the class characters and relations are implicitly present, though they are brought into relief in determinate perception. This view is supported by Pārthasārathi Miśra. Indeterminate perception or sense-experience and determinate perception or perceptual judgment are the rudimentary and the advanced types of a process which is essentially identical in nature. Since indeterminate perception does not transcend immediacy, is dumb and unanalysed, is what James calls "raw unverbalised experience," the distinction between true and false does not apply to it.[1] "The first time that we see light, in Condillac's phrase, we *are* it rather than *see* it."[2] There is therefore no possibility of error in simple apprehension. In perceptual judgment, where a predicate is ascribed to a subject, the logical issue arises, since our judgment may or may not conform to the objective order. When we say "That is a man," our knowledge in so far as it is called "that" is true, while in so far as it is described as "man," it may or may not be true.[3]

The Buddhist logicians contend that determinate perception is mediate knowledge which is not free from preconceptions, while indeterminate perception is free from preconceptions (kalpanāpoḍham).[4] The latter does not

[1] See Nīlakaṇṭha's *Tarkasaṁgrahadīpikāprakāśa.*

[2] James: *Principles of Psychology,* vol. ii, p. 4. See also N.B., iv. 2. 37.

[3] N.B., iii. 2. 37.

[4] Kalpanā, according to Dharmakīrti, is the activity of thought by which a name is given to the object. Abhilāpasaṁsargayogyapratibhāsapratītiḥ

apprehend the qualifications of the object, such as generality, substantiality, quality, action, name, but simply grasps the specific individuality of the object, its svalakṣaṇa.[1] The real with which we come into contact is inexpressible, and what we express has for its province concepts. Dharmakīrti says, " the object of perception is like itself (svalakṣaṇa), while that of mediate knowledge is like one of its class (sāmānyalakṣaṇa). The given is the unique, the particular and the momentary; the known is the typical, the universal and the lasting.[2] The moment we say something about the felt real, we bring it into relation to something else, and the real thus loses its nature, becoming overlaid with the inventions of the intellect. We hear the humming which alone is true, but that it is due to the fly or the distant steam-whistle is our imagination. Dharmottara argues that even the cognition of the mother's breast by the infant the second time is determined by its past experience, and is not therefore pure or undetermined. All relations, as Kant would say, are the forms which our mind imposes on the given elements to make them into objects of knowledge. In determinate perception we twist the real out of its shape, and so it is said to be invalid.[3] Dignāga dismisses

kalpanā. It is the knowledge which is capable of connection with words. Jayanta holds that kalpanā signifies the connection of an object with its adjuncts as genus (jāti), quality (guṇa), action (kriyā), name (nāma), and substance (dravya) (*Nyāyamañjari*, p. 97). According to the Buddhist view there is no difference between the individual and the genus, the particular and the universal, substance and quality, and our determinate perception attributes differences where they do not exist. We do not perceive the genus of the cow apart from the cow, or the substance cow apart from its qualities. Nor is motion different from that which moves. When we give a name to an object, we identify things which are different. When we say " This is Caitra," " this " refers to an object and " Caitra " to a word, and our judgment identifies the two. Similarly, the category of substance ascribes identity or coinherence to objects that are essentially different. In the case of " This is the man with a stick," " man " and " stick," which are different from each other, are said to inhere in the same substratum. So it is argued that these categories are ideal constructions. (*Ibid.*)

[1] Sajātīyavijātīyaparāvṛttaṁ svalakṣaṇam (*Nyāyamañjari*, p. 97).

[2] *Śāstradīpikā* describes the view that the universals are unreal products of fancy: " Vikalpākāramātraṁ sāmānyam, alīkaṁ vā " (p. 278).

[3] Kant, however, denies the possibility of indeterminate perception by which, the Buddhist imagines, the bare difference is intuited. Cp. his famous statement, "Perceptions without notions are blind and notions without perceptions are empty," though this conflicts with the earlier view of the *Prolegomena* (18), with its distinction of judgments of perception and judgments of experience.

all knowledge of substances, qualities and actions as false.[1] The outer objects are momentary and so cannot be known.[2] Constructive imagination works up the momentary stage into a series penetrated by the past and projecting into the future. The unreal (an-artha) is the world of thought. The absolutely real (paramārthasat) is the felt sensation.[3] The whole view is determined by the metaphysical presuppositions of these thinkers. Dignāga is a subjectivist who looks upon all knowledge as purely mental. The question of the nature of the real is left undecided by him, though the facts of perception compel him to concede that we come into contact with some reality, however momentary it may be. Dharmakīrti, with his Sautrāntika leanings, admits extra-mental reals to account for the variation in perception, though their momentary character renders knowledge of them impossible. He makes sensations individual and their objective reference inferential.

The Naiyāyikas subject the Buddhist view to severe criticism. Uddyotakara argues that pure sense knowledge specific in itself and cognised by itself, without any admixture of name or genus, is an impossibility. Our cognition of an object invariably assumes the generic form.[4] The Buddhist view that all universals are imagined, since specific individuals alone exist, is rejected by the Naiyāyikas, who hold that the universals are as real as the individuals in which they subsist by the relation of inherence (samavāya). This relation is either directly perceived or inferred from the fact that we are conscious of individuals as forming real kinds. The ultimate appeal is to the nature of things which manifests itself in and determines our consciousness. The relations are not superinduced on the given but are observed within the nature of the real. All that our understanding does is to discover the relation in the fulness of the real. If the *real* excludes relations and the object of knowledge is relational, then we are committed to the false antithesis of the noumenon and the phenomenon. The object known is not the object as it is in

[1] See Ui: *Vaiśeṣika Philosophy*, p. 67.
[2] Kṣaṇasya (jñānena) prāpayitum aśakyatvāt (*Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, p. 16).
[3] *Nyāyabindu*, p. 103.
[4] N.V., i. 1. 4.

itself but an intermediary, a *tertium quid* interposed between the cognising subject and the stimulating object. But, as we have seen, the Nyāya regards indeterminate perception as identical in essence with determinate perception. The relations do not suddenly emerge out of nothing. They are present in indeterminate perception, though we become conscious of their presence in determinate perception. The object of determinate perception, Jayanta argues, is not unreal since it is apprehended by indeterminate perception also. The mere presence of ideal factors or remembered elements does not interrupt sense-activity. The complexity of determinate perception is not a logical defect. The exercise of thought involved in it strengthens the case for its validity. If determinate perception apprehends what is already apprehended in indeterminate perception, that is no reason why it should not be true. Novelty is not the test of truth. The ideal elements are not mere fancies (vikalpas). The universal which is an object of direct perception is not a mere name, since it is apprehended even in the absence of a name. When a visitor from the Deccan sees camels in North India, he notices their universality though he may not know the name. When we perceive our four fingers we notice their general features as well as their distinctive properties. If we simply take in the special individuality of the object, we should not be able to relate the second instance with the first. If it is argued that the first case is remembered when the second is perceived, Jayanta holds that nothing is to be gained from remembering the first since it is unrelated to the second. If it means that the perception of the second suggests the first, since the two belong to the same class, then it is clear that in the case of the first perception also there was a cognition of its universality as well as individuality. There is apprehension of the universal and the particular, indistinctly in indeterminate perception and distinctly in determinate perception. Even the Buddhists do not deny that we have a notion of universality (anuvṛttijñāna) when we perceive an individual, and the question arises as to the basis of this knowledge (anuvṛttijñānotpādikā śaktiḥ) whether it is the individual or something different from it, eternal or non-eternal, perceptible or non-perceptible, for if there is a peculi-

arity in the cognition, there must be an answering peculiarity in the object of cognition.[1] The universal is therefore different from the individual, eternal since it is universal, while the individuals die and are born, and real whether perceptible or inferrible.[2] The argument that determinate perception depends on the recollection of the word denoting its object and not on the direct contact of the object with the sense-organ is criticised on the ground that though determinate perception is a complex of sense-presentation and the memory image, the principal factor is the sense-contact, while the recollection of the name is auxiliary. Whether a cognition is perceptual or not depends on the presence or absence of peripheral excitement.[3]

We reach here a fundamental divergence between the conceptions of reality advocated by the Buddhists and the Naiyāyikas. The former assume that the real is the simple *this*, the momentary individual shut up within its quality,

[1] Viṣayātiśaya vyatirekeṇa, pratyayātiśayānupapatteḥ (*Nyāyamañjari*, p. 314).

[2] See *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 309–311, 313–314. Cp. the Nyāya view with that of Saint Thomas that the primary object of man's knowledge is a synthetic unity in which both the senses and the understanding play their indispensable part. The individuation or the quantitative specification is derived from the sense, while the qualitative unity is from the understanding. The object of knowledge contains within itself the intuition of essence and the sense-knowledge of particulars. It is neither the essence alone, as Descartes thought, nor the sense-datum alone, as the empiricists believed. We know things, and things are neither disembodied essences nor subjective images. To separate universals from individuals is to miss the unity of the two in things.

[3] *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 193. Pārthasārathi Miśra says, " savikalpam api, anuparatendriyavyāparasya, jāyamānam aparokṣāvabhāsatvāt, pratyakṣam eva " (*Śāstradīpikā*, pp. 103–4). The Buddhists argue that determinate perception is not direct (aparokṣa) or distinct (viśada), though it seems to be so, from its connection with the immediately preceding indeterminate perception. But this is a conjecture. Prabhācandra also criticises the Buddhist view. Indistinctness is not peculiar to determinate perceptions. Perceptions of objects at a distance hidden by glass or mica are indistinct, be they determinate or indeterminate. If determinate perception is invalid on the ground that it perceives what is already apprehended, then inference also is invalid, since it apprehends what has already been apprehended in the cognition of universal concomitance. On the Buddhist view all objects are momentary, and so no perception is possible. Even in inference we do not grasp the specific individuality of the object, but that does not make inferential knowledge invalid. The presence of word or ideal relations has nothing to do with validity. Liability to error is common to, and practical efficiency is present in both determinate and indeterminate perception.

without either continuance in time or extension in space—"sarvam pṛthak." All relations are an arbitrary network spread from the outside by imagination. The Naiyāyika, on the other hand, contends that what exists is not the momentary quality but the individual with an internal diversity of content. In spite of the manyness it remains one. It is the one in the many. So far as it is one against other individuals, it is a particular; so far as it is the same throughout its diversity, it is universal, and this sameness makes it also a member of a class. Every individual has these two sides or aspects. The atomic particular which excludes all differences, as well as a mere relation which has no terminal points, is a superstition which cannot be verified in experience. Identity and difference are distinguishable moments within a whole, which become false when they get hardened into units that stand by themselves. Modern psychology confirms the Nyāya view that the content of the given has the two sides of sensible qualities and relations.

A superficial view leads us to think that crude sense-impressions which are the raw material of knowledge are the highest reality. But it is difficult to accept the position that man's scrappy impressions are the truth of things. Chaotic masses of stone, brick and wood are not a house. The felt impressions are not knowledge. Solipsism confined to the present moment leads us straight to intellectual suicide, by reducing the life of thought to a tale of fancy. The Buddhists identify passive awareness with a feeling of reality. They ask us to free ourselves from the sin of reflection. But their passion for immediacy is a sheer prejudice. Loyalty to fact does not mean freedom from reflection. I do not wantonly indulge in the folly of reflection when I say that that which I see before me is an orange. Apperception is a normal function of the human mind. The mind of man is not an empty room into which sensations simply walk. Every perception is the result of an active reaction to a stimulus. We are born thinkers, and cannot help interpreting what we receive. Sensations do not come to us detached. They come to us with a sense of objectivity. They are presented, surrounded by a complex mass of other elements. The atomic "now" has no existence. Every particular point in space has other

points round it, as every instant of time flows ceaselessly into another. The Buddhist view divorces " sense " from " understanding " and makes them two totally disparate functions. The sense-data combine in various ways and build up the world of knowledge. They possess relations which our knowledge disentangles. We do not alter or make reality in knowledge. What is vaguely perceived at the sense-level is clearly grasped when we rise to the level of understanding. The real is the related and the rational. The full nature of reality yields itself neither to the senses nor to the understanding, but to the complete spirit.

Dharmakīrti recognises four kinds of perceptions: sense-perception, mental perception (manovijñāna), self-consciousness and yogic intuition. Sense-perception is mediated by the senses. Mental perception (manovijñāna) is said to be similar to sense-perception as belonging to the same series (ekasaṁtāna) and arising at the next moment to sense-perception. It seems to be somewhat of an after-image, for Dharmottara says, " Mental perception cannot arise unless and until the eye has ceased to function for the time being. For if the eye remains active, we continue to have the perceptions of form, visual or sensuous perceptions."[1] The internal perception of pleasures and pains is brought under the third variety, *svasaṁvedanā* or self-consciousness. We perceive the self through the perception of its states as pleasure or pain. It is direct intuition by which the self is revealed (ātmanah sākṣātkāri), free from intellectual interference and therefore from error. It is said to accompany all mental phenomena. Dharmottara identifies this self-consciousness with the feeling of intimacy and emotional warmth

[1] Btac ca manovijñānam uparatavyāpāre cakṣusi pratyakṣam iṣyate, vyāpāravati tu cakṣuṣi yad rūpajñānaṁ tat sarvaṁ cakṣurāśritam eva (*Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, p. 13). Cp. Richard Semon's view that we experience sensations in two forms, either as original or as mnemic. The original sensation is synchronous with the excitation, and in this form the sensation perishes when the excitation ceases, but, like the storm at sea, which, when it ceases, is followed by the gradual dying down of the waves it has raised, so the sensation dies down after the excitation has ceased. It is the after-image effect which Semon names the *akoluthic* stage of the original sensation. Semon says that the original sensation leaves behind an engram which on occasion and subject to conditions may give rise to a sensation called mnemic and not original. See Semon's *Mnemic Psychology*.

which accompanies all perception. Later Nyāya makes it a secondary product supervening on consciousness. According to Gaṅgeśa, it occurs when we say "I know this is a pot." Vyavasāya or determinate cognition gives us the cognition of an object, but the cognition that "I am aware of the object" is called anu-vyavasāya or after-cognition. "This is a jar" is a cognition; "I know that this is a jar"[1] is anu-vyavasāya, or what follows the cognition of the object. The Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta believe that every mode of consciousness reveals an object as well as itself, as involving a self.[2]

[1] Dīpikā, 34.

[2] The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view differs from that of Kumārila, who holds that a cognition is inferred from the cognisedness of the object. The Jainas, the Vedāntins, and some Buddhists believe that a cognition is cognised by itself. A cognition, according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, cannot turn on itself and make itself the object of cognition. A cognition manifests another (paraprakāśaka) and not itself (svaprakāśaka) It is manifested by another cognition, since it is an object of knowledge like a cloth (jñānaṁ jñānāntaravedyam prameyatvāt paṭādivat). The Jaina criticism of this view may be briefly stated: (1) As pleasure is cognised by itself and not by another, as the divine cognition is cognised by itself and not by another, so every cognition of the self must be regarded as self-cognised; otherwise one cognition has to be cognised by another, and that by still another, and this would lead to infinite regress. (2) A flimsy argument that in God there are two cognitions, one which apprehends the entire universe and the other that cognises this apprehension, is easily criticised. Is the second cognition perceived or not? If perceived, is it perceived by itself or by another? If by itself, then why should we not allow that capacity to the first? If by another, we are committed to an infinite regress. If we say that the second is apprehended by the first, then we are involved in circular reasoning. If the second is not perceived, then if it can perceive the first, without itself being perceived, then may not the first perceive the entire universe without itself being perceived? We must admit that the divine cognition is self-cognising. It apprehends itself in apprehending the entire universe. There is no distinction between the divine and the human cognition on this question. The character of manifesting itself and another (svaparaprakāśaka) belongs to the essence of consciousness, human or divine, while omniscience is not a general characteristic, since it belongs to divine consciousness alone. (3) There is no proof of after-cognition (anuvyavasāya) by means of perception or inference. The Nyāya view that the self is in contact with manas in anuvyavasāya is not accepted, since the existence of manas is unproved (4) If a cognition is perceived by another, the second cannot arise when the first continues to exist, since cognitions are successive. It cannot arise when the first is destroyed, since there is nothing to be cognised. If it cognises the non-existent first cognition, then it is illusory, like the cognition of the double moon. (5) If the second cognition is perceived, it must be by another, which leads to infinite regress. If the second is not perceived, then how can an unperceived cognition perceive the first? This would mean that my cognition can be perceived by another's unknown to me.

According to Dharmakīrti, we perceive the four truths of Buddhism which are beyond the ordinary means of knowledge by means of yogic intuition, which is free from all error and intellectual taint,[1] albeit indeterminate in character. There are various degrees of the power of perception. Cats can see objects in utter darkness and vultures can descry their prey from a great distance. By constant practice of meditation a man may acquire supersensuous vision, and can apprehend all objects near and far, past and future, remote and hidden.[2] This highest kind of insight has the immediacy of intuition. What is a miracle for us is a natural power of the seers. What seems to our bewildered eyes immeasurably complicated and subtle is revealed to the seers *sub specie simplicitatis*. Everything is there transfigured. We have at the lowest level the simplicity of sense-perception of concrete objects, and at the highest yogic intuition. The former is the simplicity of the natural man, of the once-born type, the latter that of the spiritual man, of the twice-born type. The one comes before the great struggle of self-discovery begins, the other when it ends. The latter is an achievement issuing out of much knowledge and inward agony. Yogic intuition apprehends reality as it is in its fulness and harmony.[3] Yogic intuition differs from divine omniscience in that it is produced, while the latter is eternal.[4]

Gangesa distinguishes ordinary (laukika) perception from transcendent (alaukika) perception. There are three varieties of transcendental perception produced by three kinds of transcendental contact

(6) The argument that as sense-organs are not perceived, though they produce the apprehension of objects, so the unperceived second cognition may produce the apprehension of the first cannot be seriously pressed, since it must then be allowed that the first cognition of an external object apprehends its object, though it is not itself perceived, a position which the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika repudiates (*Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, pp. 34 ff.).

[1] See also *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, pp. 14–15. See V.S., ix. 1. 13; I.L.A., pp. 81 ff.

[2] *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 103. Bhāsarvajña holds that yogic powers may also be had by the grace of God.

[3] Ārṣajñāna, or the intuitive knowledge possessed by the sages through the force of meditation, is sometimes called pratibhā, though the latter term is more often applied to flashes of intuitive genius which ordinary men at times display (P.P., p. 258).

[4] Praśastapāda distinguishes two varieties of yogic intuition (P.P., p. 187). *Nyāyakandalī*, pp. 195 ff. See also *Upaskāra*, ix. 1. 11.

(alaukikasannikarṣa), viz., sāmānyalakṣaṇa, jñānalakṣaṇa and yogajatharma.[1] The last is yogic intuition. When we perceive the generic nature of individuals we have a case of sāmānyalakṣaṇa. The ancient school of Nyāya admits the perception of generality. In Gaṅgeśa we find a greater appreciation of the work of intellect in the apprehension of universals. Through the knowledge of the generic nature of an individual, we are able to know all other individuals at all times, and all places, possessed of the same generic nature. To the objection that such knowledge of all cases, say, of smoke, would appear to make us omniscient, Viśvanātha replies that we know only the general character of all individual instances and not their mutual differences. The apprehension of generality is said to be non-sensuous, since it can be had even when there is not a particular example of smoke perceived by us. Both the particular and the universals are out there, real and are directly apprehended. The universal is not a mental construction, but a real essence abiding in the particulars. This essence reminds us of all the particulars in which it is realised. The nature of the relation between the universal and the particular is said to be inseparable and organic (samavāya). The apprehension of the universal renders possible universal connections presupposed by inferential processes.[2] Jñānalakṣaṇa occurs when we only see the sandalwood but perceive its fragrance. When we only see it, the visual presentation recalls the fragrance with which manas comes into contact. It is indirect perception. It is called also smṛti jñāna, or memory knowledge.

The Jainas think that it is a mixed mode of consciousness (samūhālambanajñānam) in which the visual presentation of sandal and the idea of fragrance are integrated. The *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* holds that the single content of knowledge includes two elements, one immediate and the other mediate.[3] While the Jainas and the Advaitins do not admit transcendental contact (alaukikasannikarsa), the Naiyāyika believes in it. He does not admit mixed modes of consciousness. Every psychosis is single, and the atomic nature of manas makes two simultaneous psychoses impossible. So he regards the visual perception of fragrant sandal as a simple psychosis, though it is preceded by the visual presentation and the recollection of fragrance. Śrīdhara and Jayanta think that the visual perception is qualified by the revival of the previously perceived fragrance, and the present perception of the fragrant sandal is due more to the manas than to the visual organ.[4] Modern psychology accounts for this phenomenon by the doctrine of the association of ideas. Yogajadharmalakṣaṇa is that which is born of meditation.

The nature of the phenomenon of recognition (pratyabhijñā),

[1] See also Laugākṣi Bhāskara's *Tarkakaumudī*, p. 9, and Viśvanātha's *Bhāṣāpariccheda*, sec. 3.

[2] The *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (i) holds that the admission of alaukikapratyakṣa renders inference and other pramāṇas unnecessary.

[3] Surabhicandanam ityādi jñānam api candanakhaṇḍāṁśe aparoksam saurabhāṁśe tu parokṣam (i).

[4] See *Nyāyamañjarī*, p. 461, and Śrīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 117.

such as that "this is the same jar that I saw," whether it is simple or complex, is discussed by the Nyāya thinkers. Is the state of recognition a confusion of two cognitions—one directly apprehended, the jar seen and the other remembered, the jar with which the present one is identified? Is it one cognition which is in part perception and in part memory, as Prābhākara believes, or pure remembrance (smṛti) or pure perception (anubhūti)? The Buddhists look upon it as a mechanical compound of presentative and representative mental states.[1] It is not a single psychosis of the nature of presentation or representation, since its cause is not a mere sense-impression, for there cannot be a sense-contact with a past object; and it is not a residual trace or saṁskāra; since there is a consciousness of "thisness" in the state of recognition. Nor is it a combination of these two, since the two operate separately and issue in different effects. Even if we allow that the phenomenon of recognition is a single unitary effect, what is the nature of its object? Not an event in the past, since in that case recognition is not different from recollection; not an event of the future, since recognition then would become one with constructive imagination; not merely the present object, since recognition identifies a present object with a past one. It is self-contradictory to hold that it apprehends an object as existing in the past, present and the future. The Naiyāyika therefore contends that recognition is a kind of qualified perception, giving us a knowledge of present objects as qualified by the past. We see an object and recognise it as having been perceived on a previous occasion.[2] The Mīmāṁsakas and the Vedāntins support this view, while the Jainas argue that the state of recognition though simple is of a character different from that of perception or of memory.[3] Every perception involves an element of inference. When we perceive a tree, we really perceive only a part of it (ekadeśa), a side of its surface. We synthesise the sense-impression with image or meaning and thus perceive the object.[4] The previous perception of the whole, and the

[1] See also *Khaṇḍana*, i. 14.

[2] See *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 448–459. *Mitabhāṣiṇī* (Vizianagaram Sanskrit series, p. 25) says: "So 'yaṁ devadatta ity atītavartamānakālaviśiṣṭaviṣayakaṁ jñānam pratyabhijñā." [3] *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, pp. 97–98.

[4] N.B., ii. 1. 30. See also N.B., ii. 1 31–32.

inference to that whole from the part which is now perceived, are involved in every act of perception. The elements of recollection and inference are auxiliary, while sense-presentation is the principal factor. Whatever mental state is produced by means of sense-contact is a perception, even though it may involve other elements, such as those of memory and inference.

Gautama's definition of perception includes the characteristic of freedom from error. Not all perceptions are valid. In normal perception we have: (1) the object of perception, (2) the external medium such as light in the case of the visual perception, (3) the sense-organ through which the object is perceived, (4) the manas or the central organ, without the help of which the sense-organs cannot operate on their objects, and (5) the self. If any of these fail to function properly, erroneous perceptions arise. The defects of the external objects may be due to either movement or to similarity; the shell is perceived as silver on account of similarity. If the light is dim we cannot see clearly. If our eyes are diseased or partially blind, then our perception is defective. If the manas is otherwise engaged, or if the self is emotionally excited, illusions arise.[1] The causes of illusions are generally classified under three heads: (1) doṣa, or defect in the sense-organ, such as a jaundiced eye; (2) saṁprayoga, or presentation of a part or an aspect instead of the whole object; (3) saṁskāra, or the disturbing influence of mental prejudice or habit producing irrelevant recollections. The illusion of the snake arises on the occasion of seeing the rope, since the recollection of the snake is aroused.[2]

Dreams are presentative in character, aroused by external and internal stimuli. They are produced by the revival of subconscious impressions caused by organic disturbances as well as past merit and demerit. Prophetic dreams, which even Aristotle recognised,[3] are said to be due to the influence of spirits.

Kaṇāda attributes dreams to the conjunction of the self with the central organ, manas, aided by the subconscious impressions of past experience.[4] Praśastapāda regards dreams as internal perceptions caused by manas, when the senses are subdued into sleep and cease to operate.[5]

---

[1] *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 88–89, 173.
[2] *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, p. 12.
[3] Gomperz: *Greek Thinkers*, vol. iv, p. 185.
[4] V.S., ix. 2, 6–7.
[5] P.P., p. 183; *Upaskāra*, ix. 2. 7.

They are traced to the strength of residual impressions by previous cognitions, the disorders of bodily humours and unseen forces. Śrīdhara does not look upon dreams as mere reproductions of past experience, but holds that they are centrally excited.[1] Udayana is of a different opinion, and thinks that the peripheral organs do not cease to function in dream states. He admits that dreams sometimes come true.[2] Prabhākara, in conformity with his general standpoint, makes dreams reproductions of past experiences, which, owing to obscuration of memory (smṛtipramoṣa), appear to consciousness as immediate presentations. Pārthasārathi identifies dream states with recollection.[3] Praśastapāda distinguishes dream knowledge from that which lies near to sleep or dream, called svapnāntika, which recollects what is experienced in the dream itself. Illusions which are based on an objective element (adhiṣṭhāna) are distinguished from hallucinations, which are devoid of objective basis (niradhiṣṭhāna). Śrīdhara gives as an example of the latter the case of one who, infatuated with love for a woman, perceives the semblance of his beloved everywhere.[4]

VII

Anumāna or Inference

Anumāna means literally the measuring after something. It is knowledge which follows other knowledge. From the knowledge of the sign (liṅga) we get a knowledge of the object possessing it. Anumāna is usually translated by the word "inference," which, however, is to be taken in a comprehensive sense, as including both deduction and induction. Anumāna is sometimes defined as knowledge which is preceded by perception. Vātsyāyana holds that "no inference can follow in the absence of perception." Only when the observer has perceived fire and smoke to be related to each other is he able to infer the existence of the fire on the next occasion he perceives smoke.[5] Uddyotakara mentions some points of distinction between perceptual and inferential knowledge: (1) All perception is of one kind, if we exclude yogic intuition, while there are varieties of inference; (2) Perception is confined to objects of the present time and within the reach of the senses, while inference relates to the past, the present and the future; (3) Inference requires the remembrance of a vyāpti, or a universal relation, which is not the case with

[1] Manomātraprabhāvaṁ svapnajñānam.

[2] Svapnānubhavasyāpi kasyācit satyatvam. *Kusumāñjali*, p. 147.

[3] Smṛtir eva tāvat svapnajñānam iti niscīyate. Nyāyaratnākara on S.V., p. 243.

[4] *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 179.

[5] N.B., ii. 1. 31.

perception.[1] Where perception is available, inference has no place.[2] We need not reflect much to know objects present to our perception.[3] Inference operates "neither with regard to things unknown, nor with regard to those known definitely for certain; it functions only with regard to things that are doubtful."[4] It is employed to know that part of the real which does not fall within the directly perceived. What is perceived points to something else, not perceived, with which it is connected. Bhāsarvajña in his *Nyāyasāra* defines inference as the means of knowing a thing beyond the range of the senses through its "inseparable connection with another thing" which lies within their range. Gaṅgeśa,[5] following Śivāditya,[6] defines inferential knowledge as knowledge produced by other knowledge.

Gautama distinguishes inference into three kinds: pūrvavat, śeṣavat and sāmānyato dṛṣṭam[7]; and Vātsyāyana offers slightly different explanations of this division, which indicates that even before Vātsyāyana there were conflicting interpretations of the Nyāya aphorisms. In inference we pass from the perceived to the unperceived with which it is related; and this relation may be of three kinds, according as the element to be inferred is either the cause of the element perceived or its effect, or as the two are joint effects of something else. When we see the clouds and expect rain, we have a case of pūrvavat inference, where we perceive the antecedent and infer the consequent. It is, however, used to indicate not merely inference from a cause but also inference based on

[1] N.V., ii. 1. 31.

[2] Pratyakṣatvād anumānāpravṛtteḥ (Śaṁkara: D.S.V., p. 88 n.).

[3] Ghaṭo 'yam iti vijñātuṁ niyamaḥ ko nv apekṣate.

[4] N.B., i. 1. 1.

[5] *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, ii. p. 2. Cp. Māṇikyanandi's definition of inference as sādhanāt sādhyavijñānam (*Parīkṣāmukha Sūtra*).

[6] *Saptapadārthī*, 146.

[7] Cp. P.M.S., i. 2. 19, 22, 23, 29; iii. 1. 2–3; iii. 2–1, where the words pūrva and śeṣa occur as referring to the logically prior and posterior parts of a sentence or a paragraph, and are sometimes used to refer to vidhi and arthavāda. Pūrva is the principal or the primary, and śeṣa is the secondary. Evidently in the P.M. an argument from śeṣa would be one from the subsidiary to the principal. Perhaps the Nyāya interpreted the relation of principal and secondary as one of cause and effect. See Professor Dhruva's article on "*Trividham Anumānam*" in the *Proceedings of the Oriental Conference*, Poona, p. 265.

former experience. When we see a river in flood and infer that there was rain, we have a case of śeṣavat inference, where we perceive the consequent and infer the antecedent. It is also used to cover the inference of one member of a pair of correlatives from the other, or inference from a part or from elimination. The inference of the nature of sound as quality is given to illustrate the principle of exclusion or elimination. We prove that sound is not generality, particularity or inherence, not even substance or action, and so conclude that it must be a quality. When we see a horned animal and infer that it has a tail, we have a case of sāmānyatodṛṣṭa inference. It is based, not so much on causation, as on uniformity of experience. Uddyotakara agrees with this and gives as an illustration the inference of the existence of water in a particular place from the appearance of cranes. It is also used to indicate inference of supersensible truths (sāmānyato' dṛṣṭa).[1] We perceive the different places of the sun, and infer that the sun must be moving, though we do not see it. Perceiving aversion, affection, etc., we infer the existence of a soul which we do not perceive.[2]

These illustrations are enough to bring out the necessity of a universal connection or vyāpti. Each vyāpti relates the two elements of a vyāpaka or the pervader and the vyāpya or the pervaded. Anumāna or inference derives a conclusion

[1] Keith thinks that this interpretation is an impossible one (I.L.A., p. 88 n.).

[2] Uddyotakara criticises Vātsyāyana's illustration of the inference of the motion of the sun from its appearance at different places in different times on the ground that we see only different portions of the solar orb and not the movement of the sun. It may be noted that Uddyotakara regards the distinction into pūrvavat, śeṣavat and sāmānyatodṛṣṭa not as three kinds of inference, but as three conditions of a valid inference: (1) pūrvavat means that the middle term (hetu) should be invariably accompanied by its antecedent (pūrva) or the sādhya or the major term; (2) śeṣavat means that the middle term must have been observed as invariably accompanied by the major term in other (śeṣa) cases; (3) sāmānyatodṛṣṭa is analysed into sāmānyataḥ and adṛṣṭa, and taken to mean that the middle term should not be common to the predicate and the absence of the predicate (P and not P, sādhya and sādhyābhāva), *i.e.* it must not be too wide, which is the fallacy of sādhāraṇa. To these, two other conditions supposed to be implied by *ca* at the end of the sūtra are added, namely, that the inference should not be opposed to perceptual and scriptural evidence. All these five conditions are to be fulfilled in a valid anvayavyatireki inference and four in Kevalānvayi and Kevalavyatireki.

from the ascertained fact of the subject possessing a property which is pervaded or constantly attended by another property. We ascertain that the mountain is on fire from the fact that the mountain has smoke, and smoke is universally attended by fire. By the contemplation of the sign, middle term, smoke, we infer that the object which has smoke has also fire. Inference, according to Uddyotakara, is the argument from sign as aided by remembrance,[1] or the knowledge which is preceded by the perception of the hetu (middle term) and remembrance of its invariable concomitance with the sādhya or the major term. The different factors of inferential reasoning are brought out in the form of the syllogism.

VIII

The Syllogism

The five members of the syllogism are: (1) pratijñā, or the proposition: the hill is on fire; (2) hetu, or the reason: because it smokes; (3) udāharaṇa, or the explanatory example: whatever shows fire shows smoke, *e.g.* a kitchen; (4) upanaya, or the application: so is this hill; (5) nigamana, or the statement of the conclusion: therefore the hill is on fire.[2]

Pratijñā, or the proposition, sets forth at the very beginning the thesis to be established. It fixes the problem and limits the inquiry. The suggestion to be established controls the process from the very start, and the act of inference tries to strengthen and reinforce the suggestion. The proposition is only a " suggestion or mere probability." [3] There can be no argument unless we are impelled to know more about (ākāṅkṣā) the suggestion or the hypothesis which is set forth in the pratijñā, or the proposition. The proposition has the two

[1] Smṛtyanugṛhīto liṅgaparāmarśo 'numānam (N.V., i. 1. 5).

[2] N.S., i. 1. 32. Cp. the names given by Praśastapāda (P.P., p. 233): pratijñā, apadeśa, nidarśana, anusaṁdhāna and pratyāmnāya. This difference in terminology suggests the independent growth of logical views in the Vaiśeṣika. Vātsyāyana points out that the syllogism contains elements contributed by the different pramāṇas. The first is verbal, the second inferential, the third perceptual, the fourth analogical, and the conclusion suggests that all these bear on the same problem (N.B., i. 1. 1).

[3] N.B., i. 1. 39.

factors of subject or what is observed, which is generally an individual or a class capable of being regarded as a single object,[1] and the predicate which is to be proved. In "the hill is on fire," the hill is the subject, the minor term, the pakṣa or the dharmin, and "on fire" is the predicate or the major term, the sādhya, the dharma or the anumeya, or that which is to be inferred. The subject calls our attention to a part of the real, and the predicate particularises the subject by suggesting its possession of a property P or its inclusion in the class of objects denoted by P. The syllogism is intended to prove that the subject presented in perception possesses the feature indicated in the predicate. The copula is an accident of language and not an essential part of the proposition.[2] The proposition should not be opposed to direct perception or the testimony of the scriptures. According to Dignāga, unintelligible, self-contradictory and self-evident propositions cannot serve as theses.[2] They should not contain any unfamiliar terms, should not be opposed to well-established truths, or one's own convictions.[3] To find out whether the proposition, S is P, is true, we attend to the minor term, analyse it into its elements and discover in it the presence of the middle term. In all reasoning, the analysis of the minor follows the statement of the thesis. The second member of the syllogism states the presence of the middle term called hetu, or ground, sādhana, or the means of proof, liṅga, or the sign, in the minor term. It gives the possession of the character which entitles its possessor to be the subject of the conclusion, or pakṣadharmatā. The hill is found to be smoky. Pakṣatā is a necessary condition of inference. Any hill is not the minor, or pakṣa, though it becomes one, the moment we perceive smoke in it and desire to infer that it has fire also. If we see the fire also, it is not a pakṣa. Pakṣa is defined by Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa as the subject in which the predicate or that which is to be proved is doubted.[4] Pakṣa is more a proposition than a term. We now have the three terms necessary for a

[1] N.S., ii. 2. 66.

[2] See *History of Indian Logic*, p. 290. See also P.P., p. 234, and V.S., iii. 1, 15.

[3] See also P.P., p. 234; V.S., iii. 1. 15.

[4] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 49 and 51, Saṁdigdhasādhyavān pakṣaḥ.

syllogistic inference, namely, the minor term or the pakṣa, that about which something is inferred, the major term or the sādhya, that which is inferred about the minor term, the middle term, by which the major is inferred to be true of the minor.

The presence of the middle in the minor (pakṣadharmatā) cannot lead to a valid inference unless it is combined with a universal relation between the middle and the major terms. The third member, udāharaṇa, or example, "whatever is smoky has fire, like the kitchen," takes us to the basis of inference, the major premise. Gautama means by example a similar instance possessing the essential property of the major term. Vātsyāyana seems to be of the same opinion. There is little to suggest that these two thinkers regarded the example as an illustration of a general rule. It was perhaps their idea that all reasoning was from particulars to particulars. Certain individuals have a given attribute, an individual or individuals resemble the former in certain other attributes: therefore they resemble them also in the given attributes. It may be that the Nyāya syllogism is developed out of the argument by example which Aristotle recognises.[1] It was soon realised that, though it is the way in which we often do reason, it is not a logical inference, where the conclusion is warranted by the premises. The argument is invalid if the example is not indicative of a general rule. The similarity (sādharmya) suggests class nature (sāmānya). Praśastapāda is familiar with the conception of sāhacarya, or concomitance, and attributes it to Kaṇāda.[2] Later logic equates the third member with the statement of the general relation.[3] No inference is possible unless there is an invariable concomitance (vyāpti) between the mark and the character inferred. The *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* says: "The instrument of inference is the knowledge of the universal relation."[4] The mention of the example indicates that inference is both inductive and deductive. The generalisation is based on

[1] Cp. the war of Athens against Thebes was mischievous, because it was a war against neighbours, just as the war of Thebes against Phokis was.

[2] P.P., p. 205.

[3] Vyāptipratipādakaṁ udāharaṇam (*Tarkasaṁgraha dīpikā*), 46.

[4] Anumitikaraṇam ca vyāptijñānam, ii.

instances, and it helps us in deducing new truths. The auxiliary and non-essential character of the example was emphasised by Dignāga. Dharmakīrti holds that the example is unnecessary and inserted only to help the person spoken to. The example illustrates but does not establish the universality of the rule. The third member, according to Dr. Seal, "combines and harmonises Mill's view of the major premise as a brief memorandum of like instances already observed, fortified by a recommendation to extend its application to unobserved cases, with the Aristotelian view of it as a universal proposition which is the formal ground of the inference."[1] Examples may be of different kinds, homogeneous or affirmative (sādharmya) where the property to be proved (major) and the ground (middle) are present, as the kitchen, and heterogeneous or negative (vaidharmya), where the property to be proved and the ground are both absent, as the lake.[2] Dignāga adds to these two, analogical examples. He also mentions ten kinds of fallacies relating to examples, while Siddhasena Divākara gives six kinds of fallacies about homogeneous and six about heterogeneous examples.

Regarding the distribution of the middle term, it is said: (1) that the middle should cover the whole of the extension of the minor, as in the illustration, "sound is non-eternal because it is a product," where the middle term product includes all cases of sound (All S is M); (2) that all things denoted by the middle must be homogeneous with the things denoted by the major, as in the example, "all products are non-eternal" (All M is P), and (3) that none of the things heterogeneous from the major term must be included in the middle, "no non-eternal thing is a product" (No non P is M). Dignāga insists that the middle term must be universally and invariably connected with the major term. Uddyotakara argues that there must be a universal relation between the middle and the major, such that, wherever the major is, there must be the middle, and wherever the major is not, the middle must not be. Praśastapāda affirms the same view when he says that the liṅga, or the middle term, is "that which is related to the object to be inferred, and is known to exist in that which is connected with that object, and does not exist where it is not present."[3] Varadarāja mentions five characteristics of the middle

[1] *The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus*, p. 252.
[2] N.B., i. 1. 36–37.
[3] P.P., p. 200.

Yad anumeyena saṁbaddhaṁ prasiddhaṁ ca tadanvite
Tadabhāve ca nāsty eva tal liṅgam anumāpakam.

term, which are: (1) pakṣadharmatā, or the presence of the middle in the minor, the smoke in the hill; (2) sapakṣasattva, or the presence of the middle in positive instances homogeneous with the proven, as smoke in the kitchen; (3) vipakṣasattva, or non-presence of the middle in negative instances heterogeneous from the proven, as no smoke in the lake; (4) abādhitaviṣayatva, or non-incompatibility with the minor; and (5) asatpratipakṣatva, or the absence of counteracting forces.[1] In the case of an exclusively affirmative or exclusively negative inference, the valid middle term fulfils only four requirements, since it cannot abide in negative or positive instances. Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa holds that the middle term is of three kinds corresponding to the three kinds of inference: (1) positive and negative (anvayavyatirekin), where the middle is invariably concomitant with the major, as smoke with fire, wherever there is smoke there is fire, as in the kitchen: where there is no fire, there is no smoke, as in a lake[2]; (2) merely positive (kevalānvayin), where we have only affirmative invariable concomitance, as in "what is knowable is nameable," where we cannot have a negative instance to illustrate the position "what cannot be named cannot be known"; and, (3) merely negative (kevalavyatirekin), where a positive instance is not possible. All beings that possess animal functions have souls, where we can prove only that chairs and tables have no animal functions, and therefore no souls, but cannot give positive instances, since souls and beings that possess animal functions are coextensive in their nature.[3] According to the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, inference from an affirmative universal is regarded as anumāna, while that from a negative universal is treated as arthāpatti, on the ground that there is not in the latter an application of a general principle to a particular case.[4] The Nyāya is, however, of the view that every

Dharmakīrti thinks that unless the middle term is present in those things in which the thing to be inferred exists, and is absent in all things in which it is not found, the inference is of doubtful validity. Siddhasena Divākara defines the middle term as "that which cannot occur otherwise than in connection with the major term." Smoke cannot arise from any other thing than fire.

[1] The first three are mentioned by Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara. See *Nyāyabindu*, p. 104, and also Laugākṣi Bhāskara's *Tarkakaumudī*, p. 12, Bombay ed.

[2] It is to be noted that the negation of the pervaded becomes the pervader in the negative vyāpti and the negation of the pervader becomes the pervaded. See S.V., Anumāna, p. 121.

[3] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 48. This distinction is accepted by Uddyotakara and Gaṅgeśa. Cp. with this the classification of inference in the Jaina canonical works into: (1) This is, because that is. There is fire because there is smoke. (2) This is not, because that is. It is not cold, because there is a fire. (3) This is, because that is not. It is cold here, because there is no fire. (4) This is not, because that is not. There is no mango-tree here, because there are no trees at all.

[4] ii.

negation has a positive opposed to it, and so affirmative conclusions can be derived from negative universals.[1] The chief characteristic of the middle term is that it should be free from all conditions. We cannot argue that A is dark simply because he is B's son, like other children of B and unlike other men's children. The conclusion may or may not be true as a matter of fact, but it is logically defective, since there is not an unconditional relationship (anupādhikasaṁbandha) between B's sonship and dark complexion.

Application is the fourth member of the syllogism. It asserts the presence or absence of the ground suggested in the minor term. It is affirmative in the former case, as in the example, " so is this hill," *i.e.* smoky, and negative in the latter case, as in the example, " not so is this hill," *i.e.* not smoky.[2]

Conclusion restates the proposition as grounded : " therefore the hill is on fire." [3] What is tentatively put forth in the first member is established in the conclusion.

Vātsyāyana points out that some logicians regarded the syllogism as consisting of ten members. In addition to the five given above, the following are included : (1) jijñāsā, or the desire to know the exact truth of the proposition, whether the hill is on fire in all its parts or in only some ; (2) saṁśaya, or doubt about the reason, whether after all that which we regard as smoke is only vapour ; (3) śakyaprāpti, or the capacity of the example to warrant the conclusion whether smoke is always a concomitant of fire, since it is not present in a red-hot iron ball ; (4) prayojana, or purpose of drawing the conclusion ; and (5) saṁśaya-vyudāsa, or the removal of all doubts about the relation of the middle to the major and its presence in the minor.[4] These five

[1] Vyāpti, or universal, may be either affirmative (anvaya) or negative (vyatireka), and of the former there are two kinds : samavyāpti (equipollent concomitance), where M and P are coextensive, as in the case " all produced things are non-eternal " ; and viṣamavyāpti (non-equipollent concomitance), where the two are not coextensive. All cases of smoke are cases of fire, but not *vice versa*.

[2] N.S., i. 1. 38.

[3] N.S., i. 1. 39.

[4] N.B., i. 1. 32. This is an indication that the form of the syllogism developed out of the practices and traditions of the art of debate. Bhadrabāhu, the Jaina logician gives a different list of the ten members of the syllogism, *viz.* : (1) pratijñā, or the proposition ; (2) pratijñā-vibhakti, or the limitation of the proposition ; (3) hetu, or the reason ; (4) hetuvibhakti, or the limitation of reason ; (5) vipakṣa, or the counter-proposition ; (6) vipakṣapratiṣedha, or the denial of the counter-proposition ; (7) dṛṣṭānta, or example ; (8) ākāṅkṣā, or doubt about the validity of the example ; (9) ākāṅkṣāpratiṣedha, or the dispelling of the

additional members of the syllogism are, according to Vätsyāyana, unnecessary for proof, though they help to make our cognitions clear. They have in view the psychological process. Jijñāsā, or the desire to know, is undoubtedly the starting-point of all knowledge; but, as Uddyotakara observes, it is not an integral factor of reasoning or proof.[1]

It was soon realised that the conclusion repeats the first proposition, while the fourth member is a restatement of the second. Strictly speaking, every syllogism has only three members. Nāgārjuna is said to have started the view of the three-membered syllogism in his *Upāyakauśalya Sūtra*, where he urges that a conclusion can be established through a reason and an example, affirmative or negative.[2] Sometimes Dignāga is given the credit for it.[3] In his *Nyāyapraveśa* he mentions only three members of the syllogism, though the third states both an affirmative and a negative example; this hill is on fire, because it has smoke; all that has smoke has fire, like a kitchen, and whatever is not on fire has no smoke, like a lake. In Dignāga the third factor is a general law with suggestive illustrations. Dharmakīrti thinks that even the third member is unnecessary, since the general proposition is implied in the reason. It is enough to say the hill is on fire because it smokes. This form which corresponds to an enthymeme is found much in use in Hindu philosophical treatises as well. The Jaina logicians, Māṇikyanandi and Devasūri,[4] are of this view. The Mīmāṁsakas and the Vedāntins admit only the three-membered syllogism. The *Vedāntaparibhāṣa* allows the use of the first three or the last three members.[5]

Both Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara argue against the attempt to dispense with the last two members of the syllogism.[6] They admit that the first member of the syllogism is restated in the conclusion,

doubt; (10) nigamana, or the conclusion (*Daśavaikālikaniryukti*, p. 74, Nirṇayasāgar edition). Bhadrabāhu here adopts the double method of proof. When a reasoning is put forward to prove the non-eternity of sound, the counter-proposition is asserted and denied by means of the statement. If sound were eternal, it would not be a product. This hypothetical reasoning lends support to the previous inference, though by itself it has not much value. Siddhasena Divākara reduces the syllogism to five members in his *Nyāyāvatāra*. Anantavīrya, commenting on the latter (13), says that the best form of the syllogism has ten members, the mediocre of five, and the worst of two.

[1] N.V., i. 1. 32.

[2] *History of Indian Logic*, p. 119.

[3] Suguira: *Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan*; Ui: *Vaiśeṣika Philosophy*, p. 82, n. 2.

[4] *Pramāṇanayatattvālokālaṁkāra*, p. iii.

[5] ii. Varadarāja, in his *Tārkikarakṣā* (pp. 82 ff.), refers to the Mīmāṁsā view of the three-membered syllogism and the Buddhist view of the two-membered. *Māṭharavṛtti* is aware of the three-membered syllogism of pakṣa, hetu and dṛṣṭānta.

[6] N.B., i. 1. 39; N.V., i. 1. 39.

while the fourth is a combination of the second and the third. Though they are unnecessary from the standpoint of logic, they are useful for purposes of debate, since they confirm the reason and reassert decisively the proposition tentatively set forth in the first member. A distinction was drawn between the five-membered syllogism, useful for convincing others (parārthānumāna), and the three-membered one, sufficient for convincing oneself (svārthānumāna). The latter deals with inference as a process of movement of thought, and so belongs to the science of discovery, while the former deals with proof. Gautama and Kaṇāda do not explicitly mention it, though later logicians admit it.[1] Praśastapāda distinguishes inference for oneself (svaniścitārtha) from inference for others (parārtha).[2] Inference for the sake of others (parārthānumāna) is rather a formal exposition. We see a hill, and are in doubt whether it has fire or not. Noticing smoke, we remember the connection between fire and smoke, and conclude that there must be fire on the hill. When we attempt to convey this information to others we use the five-membered form.[3]

In spite of differences in regard to the number of the parts of the syllogism, all logicians are agreed that the two essentials of a valid inference are vyāpti (universal relation), or the major premise, and pakṣadharmatā, or the minor premise. The former gives the universal connection of attributes, and the latter states that the subject possesses one member of the universal relation.[4] These answer to the two steps of J. S. Mill, ascertaining (1) what attributes are marks of what others, and (2) whether any given individuals possess these marks.

Neither the major by itself nor the minor by itself can warrant the conclusion. A synthesis of the two is necessary. Liṅgaparāmarśa or consideration of the sign, is the essential element of the inferential process. According to Gaṅgeśa, vyāpti by itself is the indirect cause of inferential knowledge, while liṅgaparāmarśa, or consideration of the sign, is the last cause (caramakāraṇa) or the chief cause (karaṇa).[5] It is the synoptic view of the fact that the middle related to the major

[1] Dignāga, Praśastapāda, Dharmakīrti, Siddhasena Divākara, Māṇikyanandi, Devasūri, Bhāsarvajña, and Gaṅgeśa, among others, adopt this distinction.

[2] P.P., p. 231. Cp. with this Dharmottara's distinction between jñānātmaka and śabdātmaka (*Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, p. 21) and Śivāditya's artharūpatva and śabdarūpatva (*Saptapadārthī*, 154).

[3] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, p. 45.

[4] *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, ii. p. 2; *Bhāṣāpariccheda* and *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, pp. 66 and 68.

[5] *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, ii. p. 2.

abides in the minor,[1] that leads to the conclusion. Inferential act is, however, an integral one.

The Advaita argues that there is no such thing as the reflection on the middle term. Knowledge of a universal relation is the instrumental cause; we remember it and derive the conclusion.[2] The objection seems to be directed against the view that we first have an act of perception, next an act of recollection, and lastly the act of inference. The Advaita tries to make out that the inferential act is not a putting together of two judgments, but one single process (vyāpāra), where the perceived element (the minor) operates along with the revived general principle, the major. These two elements are not substantive mental states, and are not operative as definite stages in the inferential process. The Naiyāyika, who is more of a logician than a psychologist, urges that the act of synthesis is necessary for inference.

Dignāga raises the interesting question about the nature of the thing that is inferred. We do not infer fire from smoke, since it is not a piece of new knowledge. We know already that smoke is connected with fire. We cannot be said to infer the relation between the fire and the hill, since relation implies two things, while in inference we have only one thing, the hill, as the fire is not perceived. What is inferred is neither the fire nor the hill, but the fiery hill.[3] The conclusion is a judgment.

The Naiyāyika did not attach much importance to the different positions in which the middle term might occur. He regarded Barbara as typical of all syllogistic reasoning. The use of positive and negative instances inclined him to view the affirmative and the negative general propositions as mutually involved. All inference, strictly speaking, is supported from both the sides.[4] Hindu logic has practically only

[1] Vyāptiviśiṣṭapakṣadharmatājñānam (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, p. 44). See *Bhāṣāpariccheda*, p. 66; *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, ii. 2; Jānakīnātha's *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjari*, pp. 86–87, *Paṇḍit* ed.

[2] *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*.

[3] Dignāga, quoted in N.V.T.T., N.S., i. 1. 5. *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (ii), says that the hill is perceived and the fire is inferred.

[4] If A is, then B is. If B is not, then A is not. Dharmakīrti, while agreeing that all arguments can be expressed in the affirmative or negative form, when based on likeness (sādharmya) and unlikeness (vaidharmya), thinks that some arguments fall naturally into the latter form.

All objects existent here and now are perceived.
The jar is not perceived.
Therefore the jar is not existent here and now.
This is Camestres.

one figure and one mood. From the knowledge that the subject of the proposition possesses a characteristic, which is invariably accompanied by the property, the presence of which we wish to establish, we infer that the subject has the said property. The principle is expressed in terms of connotation. If it is translated into terms of classes, we get the *dictum de omni et nullo.* Whatever may be asserted of every individual in a class may be asserted of any individual belonging to the class. The detailed distinctions of figures and moods are not so necessary for purposes of correct thinking, though they afford a training-ground for subtle thinking.[1] Aristotle admitted that the last three figures could be reduced to the first. The Nyāya recognises even in the first figure only Barbara. Darii and Ferio are not used in the Nyāya, since the conclusion refers always to a limited object, and the distinction between the universal and the particular does not arise. This distinction is only relative, as what is universal with regard to a limited class is particular in a wider reference. The minor term in the Nyāya syllogism is always an individual object or a class, and so a universal and not a particular. A conclusion about " some " cases gives us no definite information about the individual case in question. Celarent is easily derived from Barbara. Aristotle admitted that all his moods could be reduced to the first two moods of Figure I, and these two are interchangeable if we know that all judgments are double-edged.

The analysis of the reasoning process resembles pretty closely the syllogistic analysis of Aristotle. Even the five-membered form has only three terms, and the three-membered syllogism has three propositions, which correspond to Aristotle's

[1] Gomperz says : " At an enormous expense of original thought, Aristotle investigated the forms of inference, distinguished them, and analysed their ramifications. And, lo and behold ! in all his numerous works, covering the whole domain of knowledge which was then accessible, he makes practically no use of the ' kinds ' (moods) and ' figures ' of the syllogism. He does not even shrink from the admission that all this great wealth of forms might be reduced to a few fundamental ones without loss in practice. We may add that subsequent research, greatly as it has developed and refined its instruments, confirms him in this : that the figures and the moods have remained a collection of curiosities, preserved by the history of science, but never put to practical use by science itself " (*Greek Thinkers*, vol. iv, pp. 44–45). See also H. N Randle : " A Note on the Indian Syllogism," October, *Mind*, 1924

conclusion, the minor premise and the major premise. The attempt has been made to account for the striking similarity by theories of mutual influence. Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇ says: "It is not inconceivable that the knowledge of Aristotle's logic found its way through Alexandria, Syria and other countries into Taxila. I am inclined to think that the syllogism did not actually evolve in Indian logic out of inference, and that the Hindu logician owed the idea of the syllogism to the influence of Aristotle."[1] The learned professor believes that the art of the syllogism is "borrowed," while the doctrine of inference is an indigenous growth. Professor Keith writes: "Of logical doctrine in its early stages there is no reason whatever to suspect a Greek origin: the syllogism of Gautama and Kaṇāda alike is obviously of natural growth, but of stunted development. It is with Dignāga only that the full doctrine of invariable concomitance as the basis of inference in lieu of reasoning by analogy appears; and it is not unreasonable to hazard the suggestion that in this case Greek influence may have been at work."[2] He supports this suggestion by referring to the knowledge of Greek astrology possessed by Āryadeva, a predecessor of Dignāga by nearly two centuries. This, coupled with the alleged influence of Aristotle on the Hindu theory of drama as found in the Bharata Śāstra, makes probable some sort of cultural intercourse between India and Greece. It is sometimes made out that Aristotle was much influenced by the Hindu theory, which was conveyed to him by Alexander, who is reported to have had conversations with the logicians of India. Little positive evidence of direct influence is available, and when we remember that syllogistic types of reasoning are to be met with even in pre-Aristotelian works of the Hindu and the Buddhist thinkers,[3] it is difficult to accept the theory of "borrowing" from Greece. The words of Max Müller can bear repetition, "that we must here also admit the existence of undesigned coincidences to a much larger extent than our predecessors were inclined to do. We must never forget that what has been possible in one country is possible in another

[1] *History of Indian Logic*, p. xv. [2] I.L.A., p. 18.
[3] *History of Indian Logic*, p. 500, n. 1, and Appendix B.

also." [1] This view is strengthened when we realise that there are fundamental differences between the Greek and the Indian syllogisms. There is little in the analysis of reasoning in Greek logic answering to the example which the Hindu thinkers regarded as indispensable for the statement of the universal relation. It does not require much thought to grasp that the basis of the inference is the universal relation, for the example is just the suitable embodiment of that relation.

IX

Induction

Inference claims to be true of reality, and the claim cannot be sustained unless the two premises are true. The minor premise is the result of perception, and the major takes us to the problem of induction.

How are universal propositions arrived at ? The Naiyāyika gives us different answers. He speaks of enumeration, intuition and indirect proof. The syllogism mentions an example along with the rule. While an example may be sufficient to illustrate a rule, it cannot by itself establish a universal relation. There may be invariable concomitance of the smoke in the kitchen with the fire in it, or of the smoke in the sacrificial ground with the fire in it, but from these we cannot infer fire in a hill, simply because we perceive smoke in it, unless we establish the invariable concomitance of all cases of smoke with cases of fire. If we observe smoke and fire in a number of instances, we are perhaps on better ground. Bhūyo darśana, or frequency of experience, without a single exception (avyabhicarita sāhacarya), helps us in framing a general rule. It is not enough if we observe smoke wherever there is fire; we should also notice that there is no smoke where there is no fire. Agreement in presence and agreement in absence are both necessary.[2] If uninterrupted agreement (niyatasāhacarya) is reinforced by absence of exceptions (avinābhāvarūpasaṁbandha), we have unconditional concomitances,

[1] S.S., pp. 385-386.

[2] Sāhacaryajñāna and Vyabhicārajñānaviraha (*Tarkasaṁgraha*

which exclude upādhis, or adventitious conditions.[1] We do not have smoke wherever we have fire. A red-hot iron ball has no smoke in it. Only fire fed by wet fuel is concomitant with smoke. The relation of fire and smoke is a conditional one, while that between smoke and fire is an unconditional one. The principle "all cases of fire are cases of smoke" is inadmissible, while the other, "all cases of fire fed by wet fuel are cases of smoke," is admissible. A condition is not necessarily a defect, since it misleads only when it is not recognised. Whenever conditions are suspected, it is necessary for us to examine the accompanying circumstances and show that the concomitance holds even when the suspected condition is absent. The positive instances disprove the case for conditions, since they show that the middle and the major are present, while nothing else is constantly present: the negative instances support the case by showing that the middle and the major are absent even when no other material circumstance is constantly absent. Later logic laid the greatest stress on the negative instances and even defined vyāpti so as to bring out the exclusive adequacy of the sign to the thing signified.[2] The Naiyāyika demanded that the disciplined mind should control its fancies and bow beneath the hard yoke of facts. An accurate account of the experimental methods is possible only with the development of the experimental sciences; and, in the absence of the latter, the Indian logician's views about

[1] Udayana defines a condition or upādhi as a thing which imparts its own property to another object placed in its vicinity (upa samīpavartini, ādadhāti saṁkrāmayati, svīyaṁ dharmam ity upādhiḥ). The red flower which makes the crystal placed over it look like a ruby by imparting to it its own redness is an upādhi. Cp. Varadarāja's definition, sādhanāvyāpakāḥ, sādhyasamavyāptā upādhayaḥ (*Tārkikarakṣā*, p. 66). A valid universal must be free from all conditions (nirupādhikaḥ) which are suspected by oneself (śaṁkita) or with which one is charged by one's opponent (samāropita). See also Vācaspati's N.V.T.T., i. 1. 1. In logic, according to Udayana, an upādhi is (1) that which constantly accompanies the middle term, and (2) is accompanied by it, and (3) which does not constantly accompany the major term. Four kinds of upādhis are recognised in *Tarkadīpikā*. See Athalye: *Tarkasaṁgraha*, p. 317.

[2] After reviewing several definitions of vyāpti, Gaṅgeśa concludes that 'invariable concomitance is the co-presence of the middle term with the major term, which is not qualified by the nature of the counterpart of that absolute non-existence, which abides in the same locus with the middle term, but abides in a different locus in respect of that counterpart" (*Tattvacintāmaṇi*, ii) See *History of Indian Logic*, p. 424.

scientific method are not of great interest. The Naiyāyika was aware of the general problem of induction and the method of careful observation of the facts of nature by which universal propositions are arrived at.

Nature does not always supply us with positive and negative instances of the right kind to help us to establish or reject theories. The Naiyāyika says that we may employ the method of tarka or indirect proof to obtain the negative evidence. If the general proposition, where there is smoke there is fire, is not valid, then its contradictory that " sometimes smoke is not accompanied by fire " must be true. In other words, fire is not the invariable antecedent of smoke. But we cannot deny that fire is the cause of smoke. Thus tarka is employed to strengthen a universal proposition based on positive instances of uninterrupted agreement. It is also a way of establishing a hypothesis.[1] By pointing out the absurdities in which we are landed, if we deny a suggested hypothesis, indirect proof tends to confirm the hypothesis. It shows that no other hypothesis is able to account for the facts.[2]

Tarka is only an aid to the empirical method of induction, which cannot give us universal propositions. Even when we observe all possible cases and strengthen our conclusion by the method of indirect proof, still we do not reach absolute certainty about universal propositions. So long as they are based on limited observation, they do not possess any necessity. Enumerative universals are only probable, but not certain. While it is true that the experience of sensible particulars gives rise to the knowledge of the universals, it

[1] N.S., i. 1. 31.

[2] " A legitimate hypothesis must satisfy the following conditions: (1) The hypothesis must explain the facts. (2) Must not be in conflict with any observed facts or established generalisations. (3) No unobserved agent must be assumed where it is possible to explain the facts satisfactorily by observed agencies. (4) When two rival hypotheses are in the field, a crucial fact or test is necessary; the absence of such a test is fatal to the establishment of either. (5) Of two rival hypotheses, the simpler, *i.e.* that which assumes less, is to be preferred, *caeteris paribus*. (6) Of two rival hypotheses, that which is immediate or relevant to the subject-matter is to be preferred to that which is alien or remote. (7) A hypothesis that satisfies the above conditions must be capable of verification before it can be established as a theory " (Seal: *The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus*, p. 288)

cannot be said that the apprehension of the universals is fully accounted for by the sensible particulars, since the universal goes beyond any or all of the particulars.

Even collective judgments presuppose a knowledge of the universal. We do not count up all instances, but only those which possess a generic quality which entitles them to a place in the group. So even the method of enumeration cannot operate without an apprehension of the universal. The ancient Nyāya asserts that we can discern universals by means of perception. Gaṅgeśa recognises the non-sensuous activity involved in the apprehension of the universals (sāmānyalakṣaṇa), when he makes it a variety of alaukika pratyakṣa, or non-sensuous intuition.[1] On either view it is not necessary for us to make an exhaustive survey of instances. Through the perception of the universal smokiness, we apprehend all cases of smoke. We apprehend the universals of fire and smoke by sāmānyalakṣaṇapratyāsatti, and realise their invariable relation. So by analysis of one instance we can discern the universal relation; and what is true of that instance can be rightly extended to all members of the class, since there is such a thing as identical nature. What is once true is always true. When we say "smoke," we do not have in our mind all cases of smoke; but the connotation of smoke is what is in our thought. The connotations of smoke and fire are related in the vyāpti as the vyāpya, the pervaded, and the vyāpaka, the pervader. A multiplicity of instances is necessary, not because we abstract the universal relation from these particulars, but because the relation is not clearly differentiated in a single case. Those with exceptional powers of discrimination can differentiate relations even from a few instances. The universal relation is a discovery and not a creation. Through an act of thought exercised on a single instance we can obtain a universal connection. If the universal relation is not presented to us in the judgment itself, a repetition of similar events cannot help us to it. It is given

[1] Cp. with this Aristotle's apprehension of the universal by *nous* following upon the perception of the relevant particulars. An enumeration of instances, even when exhaustive, cannot give rise to absolute certainty unless we transcend the contingency of matter (Aristotle: *An. Post.*, I. 5).

to the subject and not constructed by the understanding. What transcends sense-perception does not transcend experience. Methodical observation and experiment but confirm what is intuited sometimes from a single case. Every event of nature contains within itself the relation or law in accordance with which it has been brought about. It is intuition alone that helps us to distinguish the essential features of a given event from its accidental accompaniments. Universal propositions are connections of content. If all little-biled animals are long-lived, it is not because man, horse and mule, which are little-biled, are long-lived, but because there is a necessary connection between the contents of little-biled and long life. The significance of the Nyāya syllogism is best brought out if it is put in the hypothetico-categorical form. If A, then B. A, therefore B.

On this view, the problem how deductive reasoning can give us more in its conclusion than was contained in its premises appears in a new light. General principles are not enumerative judgments, and the relations which govern the particulars are as real as the particulars themselves. When we derive a particular truth from a universal judgment, the conclusion goes beyond the premise in one sense, though it is contained in it in another.

But if universal relations are real and require only to be intuited, how is it that lovers and lunatics miss the significance of those general principles which leap to the eye of scientists and philosophers? Nor is it easy to account for the fact that our generalisations sometimes fail to be true. The relations are not correctly apprehended in erroneous inductions. They are not properly differentiated from the unlimited fulness of the particulars. The complexity of reality makes discrimination of relations difficult. Under the influence of passion and prejudice, inertia and thoughtlessness, we accept propositions as true, though they are not so. In this sense, even particular perceptions may be wrong. The intuited inductive principles become more convincing when they are applied to fresh particulars, *i.e.* when we pass from the inductive to the deductive stage. As we shall see, the validity of the universal relations, like that of all other knowledge, is to be established by other forms of knowledge. The intuition

unconfirmed by empirical verification is only a hypothesis. Mere intuition is not of much use. Exhaustion of empirical material is an unrealisable ideal. The two help each other. The general principle has some necessity about it, even though it is grasped by us only on the occasion of an empirical fact.

The Nyāya view of vyāpti assumes that universals are factors of reality[1] and universal relations are real.[2] The Cārvākas, who are materialists, deny the possibility of universal relations, and so dispute the validity of inference. The Buddhists regard universal propositions as ideal constructions and not real relations. The universal is but a name and the identity a fiction. In the Buddhist work, *Sāmānya-dūṣaṇadikprasāritā*, the theory that we perceive the universals as real is criticised. We see the five fingers of the hand and not a sixth universal, which is as unreal as a horn on one's head.[3] Though a strict interpretation of this view makes all inference impossible, still the Buddhists assume its validity for all practical purposes and distinguish different kinds of universal relations. The middle term may be related to the major by way of identity (svabhāva, tādātmya), causality (tadutpatti), or negation (anupalabdhi). It comes to this, that our inferences are either affirmative or negative, and the former may be analytical or synthetical.[4] We have an inference of the type of tādātmya, or analysis, identity, or co-existence, when we say that " this is a tree because it is a kind of pine." We have an inference of the type of tadutpatti, synthesis, causality or succession, when we say " there is fire because there is smoke." Inference by anupalabdhi, or non-perception, arises when we infer the non-existence of the jar from the non-perception of it. Universal relations are not derived from observation of facts, but are deduced from *a priori* notions of identity in essence and causal necessity. The Buddhists assume the universal validity of these principles of causality and identity, since it is impossible to live without accepting them. According to Dignāga, knowledge does not express real relations of objective existence. The relations of inherence and essence, quality and subject, from which we derive conclusions, are all imposed by thought.[5] Relations are only logical.

Vācaspati subjects the Buddhist view to a severe scrutiny. The law of causality, as the Buddhist conceives it, will be satisfied if we trace the smoke on the occasion of fire to the agency of an invisible

[1] Sāmānyasya vastubhūtatvāt (*Tarkabhāṣā*, p. 31, Poona ed.).

[2] Svabhāvikas tu saṁbandho vyāptiḥ (p. 35).

[3] Keith: *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 233. Cp. Berkeley's view of abstract ideas in *Principles of Human Knowledge*, Introduction, p. 13.

[4] *Nyāyabindu*, III.

[5] See *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 207. Vācaspati quotes from Dignāga, "Sarvo 'yam anumānānumeyabhāvo buddhyārūḍhena, dharmadharmibhāvena na bahissadasattvam apekṣate" (N.V.T.T., i. 1. 5).

demon (piśāca). Nor is there any necessity why the same effect should have the same cause. If the cause is what precedes the effect, it is not simultaneous with it. From the perception of smoke we can infer, not the present but the past existence of fire. If two things are identical, then the perception of one means the perception of the other, and there is no need for inference. Vācaspati and Jayanta urge that the relation between the pine and the tree is not one of identity, since all trees are not pines.[1] The Buddhist does not tell us how his principles of causality and identity of essence are themselves derived. There are many cases of concomitance which have little to do with causality or identity. The Naiyāyika includes all reciprocal relations under vyāpti, and not merely those of causal successions and genus and species, but such others as "all horned animals have cloven hoofs." [2]

X

CAUSE

Like all general principles, the law of causation is for the Naiyāyika a self-evident axiom known intuitively as it were and corroborated by experience. Observed causal relations confirm the principle with which all investigation starts. A cause is that which invariably precedes the effect, and is not merely accessory to but is necessary for the production of the effect. It is the antecedent member of a sequence of phenomena, the unvaried event which throughout a number of cases has happened in time before something else. But mere antecedence is not enough.[3] It must be a necessary antecedent.

Anyathāsiddha is an antecedent which is not causally connected with the effect, though conjoined with it. Viśvanātha[4] mentions different kinds of such causal antecedents. We may point to the

[1] *Nyāyamañjarī*, p. 114, and N.V.T T., i. 1. 5.

[2] Praśastapāda mentions that non-causal coexistences such as the rise of the moon is indicative of the rise in the sea and of the blooming of the water-lily" are included under vyāpti (P.P , p. 205).

[3] GLENDOWER. At my nativity
The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes,
Of burning cressets; and at my birth
The frame and huge foundation of the earth
Shaked like a coward.

HOTSPUR. Why, so it would have done at the same season if your mother's cat had but kittened, though yourself had never been born (i , *Henry IV*, 3. 1 13).

[4] *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, pp. 19–22.

spatial position of an object by means of our finger. This pointing with the finger, though it may be invariably present, is not causally related with the perception of spatial position. The potter's stick is an unconditional antecedent, while the colour of that stick is an irrelevant one. The sound produced by its motion is a coeffect. Eternal and all-pervading substances, which cannot be introduced and withdrawn at pleasure, are not unconditional antecedents. The condition of the condition, as the father of the potter, has nothing to do with the production of the pot. We are concerned only with the immediate antecedents. The co-effects of the same cause are sometimes confounded as cause and effect. The common cause of gravity brings about the rise and fall of the balance. When these co-effects are successive, the danger of mistaking the antecedent co-effect for the cause of the succeeding one is great. Whatever is unnecessary for the production of the effect is not its unconditional antecedent. The cause should not be mixed up with the collateral, indirect and adventitious accompaniments.[1] It is admitted that the cause cannot issue in the effect if there are counteracting forces. Pratibandhakābhāva or non-existence of counteracting factors, is sometimes added to the definition of cause. Keśava Miśra defines a cause as that necessary antecedent which is not taken up in the bringing about of something else. The threads constitute the cause of the cloth and not their colour, since the latter brings about the colour of the cloth and not the cloth itself.

Two things cannot be said to be causally related unless there is the positive-negative (anvaya-vyatireki) relation between them, such that the presence of the cause means the presence of the effect, and the absence of the cause means the absence of the effect. Causal relations are reciprocal and reversible. They are not mysterious forces but are ascertained from empirical successions which are uniform and exceptionless.[2] Careful observation of facts is insisted on. Udayana says: " We must diligently strive for ourselves to fix the several limitations, by determining the constant limitations and separations." [3] Nature presents us with a complex tangle of details from which our understanding selects the succession A-B, setting aside the many irrelevant details constituting the flux of actual events. We must find out whether the disappearance of the effect is due to the disappearance of the suspected cause. In all this investigation,

[1] Anyathāsiddhaniyatapūrvavṛtti kāraṇam. See *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 38; *Tarkubhāṣā*, p. 11.

[2] *Bhāṣāpariccheda*, 16.

[3] *Kusumāñjali*, i. 6.

one must be careful that no other condition is changed. The unconditionality of the antecedent cannot be ascertained without the employment of the double method of difference used in the Buddhist doctrine of pañcakāraṇi. [1]

Causal relations are not derived either *a priori* or *a posteriori*. They are not presented facts, but intellectual constructions based on presented data. To say that A is the cause of B is to go beyond the particulars of sense and apprehend the law of succession. Causation is not mere phenomenal sequence but a connection of elements. While the elements are presented, the connection is not.

The whole endeavour after causal explanation becomes useless if we admit plurality of causes. If plurality of causes were scientifically true, then inference would not be a valid means of knowledge.[2] If we see a river swollen, we cannot infer that it is due to past rain. It may be due to partial embankment. If we see ants carrying off their eggs, it may be due to the damaging of their nests and not necessarily to the coming rain. What we regard as the scream of a peacock need not imply that clouds are gathering, for it may after all be the voice of somebody imitating the peacock's scream. The Nyāya believes that there is no plurality and there is only one cause for one effect. The appearance of plurality is due to defective analysis. Plurality disappears if the effect is sufficiently limited and specialised. The swelling of the river caused by rain is different from that which results from the embankment of a part of it. The former is attended by rapid currents, abundant foam, a mass of fruit and foliage. The manner in which ants carry off their eggs before rain is quite different from the way they do when their nests are damaged. The scream of the peacock can certainly be distinguished from a man's imitation of it. If we take the effect with its distinctiveness (kāryaviśeṣa), then it will be seen to have only one specific cause (kāraṇaviśeṣa). If we take the effect abstractly. let us take the cause also in the same way. Vācaspati and Jayanta ask us to consider the full complement of the causes when the appearance of plurality vanishes. Some logicians however, assume that the different

[1] I.P., p. 463.

[2] N.B., ii. 1. 37–38.

possible causes of the same effect possess a common power or efficiency (atiriktaśakti). If we refuse to be scientific, we may accept plurality. In that case, as the later Nyāya tells us, since more than one causal aggregate can be supposed for any effect, the latter is a mark or sign, not of any one of the causal aggregates in particular, but of the one or the other of them. If we are to be certain of the absence of the effect, then we must be certain of the absence of not one such cause, but of each and every one of them. A cause, in this sense, is the one or the other of the possible alternative aggregates which, being given, the effect follows invariably and unconditionally. The defining mark of the cause (kāraṇatāvacchedaka) is the presence of the one or the other of the possible causal aggregates and nothing else.

Three different kinds of causes are distinguished.[1] (1) The material (upādāna) cause is the stuff from out of which the effect is produced, *e.g.* the threads are the material cause of the cloth or the clay of the jar.[2] (2) The non-material or the non-inherent (asamavāyi) cause is that which inheres in the material cause, and whose efficiency is well known. The conjunction (saṁyoga) of the threads is the non-material cause. The threads will remain a bundle, and not make a cloth unless they are conjoined. The colour of the threads is a non-material cause, since its efficiency in producing the colour of the cloth is well known. While the material cause is a substance, the non-material cause is a quality or an action.[3] The atomic theory of the Nyāya reduces all alteration and change in the

[1] V.S., x. 2. 1–7; *Tarkabhāṣā*, pp. 15–25; *Bhāṣāparicchedа*, 17–18; *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 40.

[2] According to the Nyāya, the destruction of the effect (kāryam) is due to the destruction of its material cause. When one thread is destroyed, the original piece of cloth is also held to be destroyed. The fact that a piece of cloth still remains, without the weaver and the shuttle, etc., being required to produce it anew, is explained by the assumption that the original material cause was not altogether destroyed, but continued to exist as a latent self-productive impression or habit (sthitisthāpakaḥ saṁskāraḥ) in the remaining threads, so that they forthwith produce a new piece of cloth.

[3] This second kind of cause is not admitted by the Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta, who regard the cause and the effect as bound by the relation of identity. No link is necessary to bind the two. The distinction between inherent and non-inherent causes is not tenable. Strictly speaking, only the efficient cause is non-inherent. While the Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta admit the material and efficient causes, the Buddhists do not admit even

physical world to the combination and the severance of parts. The ultimate constituents are practically the same, though the order of the plan into which they enter changes every moment. The efficient (nimitta) cause is distinct from the preceding ones. It refers to the motive power by which the effect originates or the means by which it is produced. The potter is the efficient cause of the jar, while his stick and wheel are regarded as accessory (sahakāri).[1] The three kinds of causes correspond to Aristotle's material, formal and efficient causes. The effect itself may be regarded as the final cause of Aristotle.

Sometimes the cause which immediately produces the effect is called karaṇa, and is defined as the peculiar cause.[2] It is, according to Keśava Miśra, the cause *par excellence*.[3] Of the assemblage of causes that which immediately produces the effect is the cause.[4] In the act of perception, knower and object of knowledge are both necessary, though the chief cause or karaṇa is sense-contact. Nīlakaṇṭha defines karaṇa as the cause without which the desired effect will never be produced.[5] The potter's stick is the instrumental cause of the jar. The stick in the forest is not the cause. It becomes the cause only when it is actually employed in producing the jar. So the qualification "vyāpāravad" is added. Modern Nyāya goes a step further and asserts that the karaṇa is not that in which the vyāpāra or activity subsists, but is the activity itself which is the proximate cause of the appropriate effect.[6]

In the later Nyāya, the effect is defined as "the counterentity of its antecedent negation." [7] It is the positive correlate of prior negation. To say that the effect has prior non-existence is to admit that it has a beginning. This is the view of asatkāryavāda, or the doctrine that the effect has no existence before it is brought into being, also known as ārambhavāda, or the theory of new beginnings. The effect does not pre-exist in the cause but originates freshly. It is the doctrine

this distinction. Every event is momentary, giving rise to another. Milk is changing every moment; only we call it at one stage milk and at another curds

[1] Among efficient causes, a distinction is made between the general and the special causes. Of the former there are eight: God, his knowledge, desire, and action, antecedent non-existence, space, time, merit and demerit, to which sometimes absence of counteracting influences is added (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, 207–208.)

[2] Asādhāraṇaṁ kāraṇaṁ karaṇam (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, 37).

[3] Prakṛṣṭaṁ kāraṇam.

[4] Avilambena kāryotpatti.

[5] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 186.

[6] Phalāyogavyavacchinnaṁ kāraṇam.

[7] Prāgabhāvapratiyogi (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, 39).

of epigenesis, or the creative process of reality that goes on adding fresh aspects to itself.[1] Some Buddhists deny that an effect before its production can be described as existent, non-existent, or both. The Nyāya contends that the effect is non-existent before its production from its cause, and this view is in conformity with the Nyāya doctrine that the whole is something other than the parts from which it is made up.[2] The Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta urge that we have in the effect the actualisation of pre-existing potentialities. According to the Sāṁkhya, the efficient cause aids the process of manifestation. The Naiyāyika criticises this view. If the cloth already exists in the threads, how is it that we do not see it? The threads are not the cloth, and we cannot wear the threads. It is no argument to say that the cloth is not manifested, since the non-manifestation is just the problem. If the manifestation means "the absence of such form as would be perceptible and capable of effective action," then it amounts to the non-existence of the effect prior to causal operation. Something which did not exist in a particular form is brought into existence by the operation of the cause.[3] The effect differs from the cause in form, potency and position. Besides, if the Sāṁkhya theory of the non-difference of the effect from the cause is true, then it would follow that the whole world regarded as the product of the primordial prakṛti would be as imperceptible as the prakṛti itself. If the effect occupies the same extension in space as the cause, it is because the effect rests or has its basis in the cause. There is no reason to reject the view, suggested by the facts of nature, that things are freshly produced and destroyed.[4] The view that when milk changes into curds there is only transformation and no destruction is not tenable. "When we perceive a new substance being produced by a fresh reconstitution, we infer from it the cessation or the destruction of the previous substance." [5] The disruption of the component particles of the milk and their rearrangement bring into existence curds. The Naiyāyika concedes that a complete destruction of the previous substance will make the formation of the new impossible. It follows that the substance only relinquishes its former condition, though the Naiyāyika is not inclined to accept it openly.

The works of the Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta, which hold a different theory of causal relation, criticise the Nyāya view. One illustration may be given here from the *Sāṁkhya kārikā*.[6] That which does not exist can never be produced. However much we may try, we cannot

[1] Kaṇāda mentions a number of arguments to show that the cause and the effect are quite different: (1) They are objects of different ideas; (2) and of different words; (3) they produce different effects; and (4) occur in different instants of time; (5) there is a difference of form; (6) of number, as the threads are many and the cloth is one; (7) if cause and effect were identical, there would be no need for any effort to derive the effect from the cause. See also N.V.T.T., iii. 2. 17.

[2] N.S., iv. 1. 48–54.

[3] N.V., iv. 1. 49.

[4] N.B., iv. 1. 49.

[5] N.B., iii. 2. 16.

[6] 9.

change blue into yellow. Again, the material cause is always found associated with the effect, as oil-seeds with oil. Since there can be no association with a non-existent thing, the effect must exist in the cause. It cannot be said that a cause might produce an effect, even though unconnected with it. For in that case, anything can be produced from anything, and there will be no necessity why a particular effect should be produced from a particular cause only.[1] If it is said that an unconnected cause produces the effect on account of some inherent potency in it,[2] then if the power is connected with the effect, it is as good as saying that the effect pre-exists in the cause; if it is not, then the difficulty as to why a particular effect is produced from a particular power is not solved. Besides, since the cause and the effect are of the same nature, if the one exists, the other must also exist. The Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta insist that, if the effect is totally distinct from the cause, there cannot be any determining principle to relate the two. The Naiyāyika says that, if the effect is not distinct from the cause, we cannot distinguish the two as cause and effect. Both views are justified, though from different standpoints.

Before we pass from this section, we may make a few critical observations regarding the Nyāya view of causation. The Naiyāyika lays stress on antecedence, which, strictly speaking, is logical and not chronological. The sun is the cause of light, and the two, the cause and the effect, are simultaneous. The real cause continues as long as the effect does, and the existence of the cause, before or after the effect is unnecessary. In the interests of practice, though not of truth, the Naiyāyika exaggerates the importance of antecedence (pūrvabhāva) for causality.[3] The Nyāya analysis into the antecedent conditions and the change which brings together the conditions and makes them into causes so as to result in the effect, is artificial. The moment the union of the conditions is brought about, the effect appears. If it does not, the cause might exist for ever and not begin to

[1] On that view, it is said that even impossible things like a hare's horn may be produced The Nyāya answers this objection by saying that it holds that whatever is produced is non-existent, and not that anything non-existent can be produced (*Nyāyamañjari*, p. 494).

[2] If the effect has no existence before it is produced, the activity of the agent must be supposed to operate elsewhere than on the effect. In other words, the agent's effort with reference to threads may give rise to jars. The Vaiśeṣika gets over this difficulty by contending that the activity applied to a certain cause gives rise to those effects only, the potentiality of which inheres in that cause.

[3] *Kusumāñjali*, i. 19.

produce its effect. No cause can exist without producing the effect. The process of change is itself the effect, and nothing else can be called the effect. The distinction into the elements by themselves, their union and the production of the effect, is purely ideal.[1] Śaṁkara rightly urges that we cannot insist on both antecedence and unconditionality or inseparability. If the cause and the effect are in inseparable union (ayuta-siddha), then the cause need not always precede the effect. It is truer to say that the cause and the effect are two modes of one thing than that they are two separate things joined together inseparably.[2] This conclusion is strengthened by the Nyāya insistence on samavāya or inherence. If the cause and the effect are related by way of inherence, then it is simpler to regard them as related to each other by way of identity (tādātmya).

It cannot be said that the facts of nature contain the causal relations in such an obvious manner that one has only to open his eyes to see them. We say that A is the cause of B, or that A is necessary or B is contingent, and thus order our experience. Causality is a form of our thought, a mode of intellect. That the universe is governed by laws, is a postulate which we accept in logic, though it has to be established in metaphysics. In life we do not ask for the real cause or the explanation of an event, but are content with the knowledge of the things that we should secure to produce a desired effect. Clay is the cause of the jar, where nature provides the clay and the potter uses it for his purpose. We can never exhaust the conditions, and so all our causal predications are relative. We say, given such and such conditions, if they are not counteracted, such and such effects are bound

[1] "Causation is really the ideal reconstruction of a continuous process of change in time. Between the coming together of the separate conditions and the beginning of the process is no halt or interval. Cause and effect are not divided by time in the sense of duration or lapse or interspace, They are separated in time by an ideal line which we draw across the indivisible process. For if the cause remained for the fraction of a second, it might remain through an indefinite future" (Bradley : *Logic*, ii. p. 539 n.). "The thread of causation is an ideal unity which we discover and make within the phenomenal flux of the given. But it has no actual existence within that flux, but lives first within the world of universals" (*ibid.*, p. 540).

[2] S.B., ii. 2. 17.

to follow. The difficulties about the cause of the cause and the consequent regress, are dismissed by the Naiyāyika as purely dialectical. Both cause and effect are passing events and not permanent facts, though we tend to speak of them as substances maintaining an identity in spite of events. The atoms themselves, if they are causes, cannot be real. Cause has no meaning apart from change, and whatever changes is a passing phenomenon. Causality, when analysed, resolves itself into a mere sequence of events, one depending on another *ad infinitum*, and yet we are obliged to use it as if it were a valid concept. It is certainly useful within the limits of experience, but we cannot regard it as of absolute validity. Causality is only a form of experience.[1]

The conception of the non-existence of the effect in the cause, adopted by the Nyāya, has its source in the naturalistic bias which regards the real as the perceived.[2] We see actually the higher and more complex levels arising out of the lower and simpler ones, in which they were not found to exist previously. Many scientific thinkers of the present day accept this view of reality as a one-way series, proceeding from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher. They may differ from the Nyāya realists with regard to the nature of the ultimate simple unit, but their ideal of explanation is in essence the same. Whether we start with material atoms, as the Naiyāyika does, or with electrons as modern scientists do, or with neutral stuff, sense-data or space-time passing through various growing complexities, as some contemporary realists do, we shall be obliged to adopt an inadequate ideal of explanation. The first condition of philosophic intelligibility is that the less can be derived from the more and not the more from the less. The natural movement of thought leads us to the acceptance of such a principle. The stream cannot rise higher than its source. If *a priori* conditions of intelligibility are violated in any such view, the conditions, we are told, must be given up. But we cannot alter the constitution of our minds at the bidding of realism. Thought is obliged to posit the implicit or the potential, and hold that the effect is implicitly or potentially prefigured in the cause.

[1] Āropita or adhyastadharma.

[2] N.B., ii. 2, 18.

A strict realism will have to treat development as mere appearance. If it regards it as more than appearance, it is not loyal to itself. Realists like Alexander assume some other principle, besides space-time when they speak of a nisus and development of higher qualities or beings. If the realist regards the real as what is actual, and dismisses the potential as a meaningless expression, then causality becomes unintelligible. The Naiyāyika violates his own view when he admits the reality of atoms and souls which are not seen. Things which we see are produced and destroyed and so are non-eternal; eternal things are not seen by us and yet they are assumed. The realist is forced to exaggerate the importance of time. Guyau observes in his little book on *Time*, "Time is made by us moderns a sort of mysterious reality designed to replace the old idea of providence and made almost omnipotent." [1] On the hypothesis of the absoluteness of time, we can never be sure of the goal of the world, which is neither fixed nor stable. We live in a universe which changes and where anything can come out of anything. There is no place for God in such a scheme, unless we piously assume that things are tending in the upward direction and God is in the making. Professor Alexander assures us that deity is the next higher quality than mind. We must ask, after God, what next?

The Naiyāyika insists on the continuity between the cause and the effect. If we attempt to formulate the Nyāya view in terms of modern science, we may say that it regards all causation as expenditure of energy. It denies the existence of any transcendent power in the mechanism of nature, if we, for the moment, overlook its view of unseen merit or demerit (adṛṣṭa). Causation is a mere redistribution of energy. The cause is the totality of conditions (kāraṇasāmagri) and the effect is what issues from it.[2] In his anxiety

[1] Quoted in the *Philosophical Review*, September 1923, p. 466.

[2] As we shall see, the Vaiśeṣika admits that the qualities of the cause are the causes of the qualities of the effect. The black colour of the clay is the cause of the black colour of the pot, unless the counteracting force of heat changes the colour. The exception to this in the Vaiśeṣika is the production of the diads from aṇus and triads from diads, where the number of the constituent elements determines the parimāṇa, or dimension The Nyāya allows a change of qualities in compound substances.

to do justice to the dictates of common sense, that things are produced and destroyed, the Naiyāyika runs the risk of overlooking the continuity of nature. He attempts to reconcile the popular view, that nothing comes from nothing, with the notion that things begin to be. The flower comes from the plant, the fruit from the tree, but yet he realises that the plant and the flower and the fruit and the tree are all unreal. The Nyāya admits the substantial identity of the cause, and holds that the collocations differ, so as to give rise to new properties. The question for metaphysics is, whether these newly produced properties are real. That they are observed by us in the effect condition, and were not observed by us in the causal condition, is quite true. But can we on that ground infer that they are real ? When the Naiyāyika allows that the changing states of the world are perishable, he admits that they are not absolutely real. The real is the unaltered, while the aggregates change form. We say popularly that things come into and go out of existence: in reality there are only integration and separation of distinct elements which can neither be produced nor be destroyed, neither be increased nor be decreased. The real abides while its states change. Even in the realm of matter the first principle of constancy is admitted. Atoms abide while their accidental aggregations pass into and out of existence. The paradoxical ring of the statement that from nothing comes something is lost when we remember that what is present in germ becomes actual. It is a misuse of language to identify one stage with something and its preceding stage with nothing.

XI

Upamāna or Comparison

Upamāna, or Comparison, is the means by which we gain the knowledge of a thing from its similarity to another thing previously well known. Hearing that a wild ox (gavaya) is like a cow, we infer that the animal which we find to be like the cow is the gavaya.[1] Two factors are involved in an

[1] Prasiddhavastusādharmyād aprasiddhasya sādhanam,
Upamānaṁ samākhyātaṁ yathā gaur gavayas tathā.
Haribhadra: *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, 23. See also N.S., i. 1. 6.

argument by comparison which are (1) the knowledge of the object to be known, and (2) the perception of similarity. While the ancient Naiyāyikas regarded the former as the principal cause of the new knowledge, the modern Naiyāyikas attach more importance to the perception of similarity.[1] Mere resemblance, whether it be complete, considerable or partial, is not enough to justify an argument by comparison. In the first case of complete resemblance or identity, there is not any new knowledge. We do not say the cow is like a cow. In the second case of considerable resemblance, the inference need not be valid, for a buffalo is not a cow, though there are many points of resemblance between the two. If there is only partial resemblance, the case is worse. A mustard seed is not Mount Meru, simply because both share the attribute of existence. In a valid argument through comparison, we do not so much *count* the points of resemblance as *weigh* them.[2] The resemblance must be important or essential[3] and have relation to the causal tie.[4] Argument by comparison gives us a knowledge of the relation between an object and its name.[5] It relates to the problem of identification. We are told that the particular name "gavaya" is given to the object which resembles the cow, and we give the name when we find such an object. Later logicians are of opinion that this mediate identification takes place through the recognition not only of similarity but also of dissimilarity (vaidharmya), as when we identify a horse which is different from the cow since it has not cloven hoofs or the characteristic nature of the object (dharmamātra), as when we identify a camel from its peculiar properties of a long neck and the like.[6] Upamāna, in this sense, does not correspond to the modern argument by analogy.

As we shall see, the Nyāya theory assumes the pragmatist view of truth as that which leads to successful activation. While this test can be applied to the objects of our experience, truths regarding the supersensible are beyond it. The Naiyāyika attempts to overcome the difficulty by means of this

[1] Sādṛśyajñānam (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, 58).
[2] N.B., ii. 1. 44.
[3] Prasiddhasādharmyāt, ii. 1. 45.
[4] Sādhyasādhanabhāva (N.B., ii. 1. 45).
[5] Saṁjñāsaṁjñibhāva.
[6] *Tārkikarakṣā*, 22.

method of comparison. If the theory of medicine propounded by the sages of old is tested and found true, then the science of spiritual freedom as expounded by them must also be true.

Since the perception of similarity plays an important part in upamāna, Dignāga regards it as a case of perception. The Vaiśeṣika includes it in inference, since the argument may be put in the form: "This object is gavaya, since it is like a cow, and whatever is like a cow is gavaya."[1] The Sāṁkhya argues that upamāna is not an independent means of knowledge, since the instruction of the forester is a case of verbal knowledge and the perception of similarity an instance of perceptual knowledge.[2] Even Bhāsarvajña brings it under verbal knowledge. Argument by comparison is a complex one involving an element of verbal knowledge derived from the forester that the gavaya is like the cow, one of perception in that we perceive the gavaya in the forest, one of memory since we remember the statement when we see the gavaya, one of inference, since we assume the general proposition that whatever is like the cow is a gavaya, and lastly, the knowledge characteristic of the argument that the name gavaya is applicable to an animal of this kind. The last is the distinctive contribution of the argument by comparison which should not be confused with the other modes of cognition, though it may have some features in common with them.[3]

XII

Śabda or Verbal Knowledge

One of the chief sources of knowledge is authority. We accept many things which we have not observed or thought about on the authority of others. We learn a good deal from popular testimony, historical tradition and scriptural revelation. The logical issues involved in this mode of acquiring knowledge are discussed under śabda, or verbal testimony.

We may refer briefly to the Nyāya views about the origin and nature of sounds, the import of words and the structure of sentences.

[1] *Upaskāra*, ix. 2. 5. [2] *Tattvakaumudī*, 5.

[3] *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, 79 and 80. The Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and the Vedānta admit the independence of the argument by comparison, though they define it in a different way. When we meet with a gavaya in the forest, we not only have a cognition of its likeness to the familiar cow, but also a cognition of the likeness of the cow to the gavaya. The latter is due to comparison, since the cow is not actually perceived while the gavaya is.

Ākāśa, which pervades all space and not air, is the substratum of sound.[1] Sound can be produced even in a vacuum, though we cannot hear it, since there is no air to convey it. The quality of sound does not depend on air though the loudness, etc., do.[2] It is, however, produced by the contact of two hard substances. One sound produces another which causes another, until the last sound ceases owing to some obstacle.[3] We cannot argue that sound is eternal simply because it has an intangible substratum.[4]

A word is a combination of letters signifying an object, by way of denotation (abhidhā) or implication (lakṣaṇa). Every word has a meaning, which is generally regarded as a

[1] " The sound series is perceived even at a time when there is no perception of anything possessing colour and other qualities, which shows that sound has for its substratum a substance which is intangible and all-pervading, and it does not subsist in the same substratum as the vibrations (kaṁpa) " (N.B., ii. 2. 38).

[2] V.S., i. 1. 6

[3] N.B., ii. 2. 35–6.

[4] Several grounds are urged to establish its non-eternality (N.S., ii. 2. 13–38). (1) Sound has a beginning, since it arises from the concussion of two hard substances, say, an axe and a tree. It cannot be said that the concussion aids the manifestation of sound but does not produce it, for the concussion and the sound are not simultaneous. We hear the sound at a great distance even after the concussion which occasioned it has ceased. (2) Sound is not eternal, since it has a beginning and an end. If it were eternal, then it must always be heard, since it is close to the perceiving organ, which is not the case. We know also that the sound ceases on account of known causes. We stop the gong by the contact of our hand with the bell (ii. 2. 32–36; V.S., ii. 2. 26–37). Vātsyāyana says that in the case of every sound there is a series of sounds, and in this series the succeeding destroys the preceding. What destroys the final sound of the series is the conjunction or impact of an obstructing substance (N.B., ii. 2. 34). Later Naiyāyikas modify this account to suit the Vaiśeṣika theory that a quality cannot subsist in a quality and cannot have another quality conjunction. Vācaspati observes that what destroys the sound is the impact with the obstacle of, not sound, but the ākāśa, which is the material cause of the sound. The impact of ākāśa with a denser substance renders it incapable of functioning as the material cause of further sounds, and when the immaterial cause of the initial sound, namely, the contact of the stick with the drum, ceases, there is nothing to start the series afresh, and thus the final sound is destroyed. (3) Sound is cognised by one of our senses as advancing in a series. It belongs to the genus of soundness, and is therefore non-eternal (N.S., ii. 2. 16). (4) Sound is spoken of as possessing the properties of products. It is described as grave, acute, etc. (5) From the fact that we repeat the sounds taught by the teacher, we cannot argue that sounds are eternal. When they were inaudible they did not exist, and we now simply reproduce them. Even different sounds may be said to be repeated, as we are said to sacrifice twice or dance twice (N.S., ii. 2. 29). (6) From the intangibility of sound we cannot argue to its eternality Motion is intangible and yet non-eternal (N.S., ii. 2. 22–24).

relation between the word or the sign and the object which it signifies.[1]

The fact of meaning is explained by the grammarians on the theory of the sphoṭa.[2] According to it, any single letter, c, o, w, or all the letters, " cow," cannot produce the knowledge of a thing corresponding to the word, since each letter perishes as soon as it is produced. Even if the last letter is aided by the impressions left by the preceding ones, a number of letters cannot explain the cognition of a thing. There must be something over and above the letters by which the knowledge is produced, and that is the sphoṭa, or the essence of sound revealed by letter, word or sentence.[3] This sound-essence produces the cognition of the thing. A single letter, unless it is a complete word, cannot signify any thing. The advocates of padasphoṭa argue that only a pada, or a word, can signify a meaning, while those of vākyasphoṭa hold that only a vākya, or a sentence, can signify a complete meaning. According to the latter, a sentence is the beginning of speech, while words are parts of sentences, and letters parts of words. Sphoṭa, or sound-essence, is said to be eternal and self-existent, bearing a permanent relation to the thing signified by it. Letters, words and sentences manifest, but do not produce, the eternal meanings. The Naiyāyikas hold that whatever is significant is a word,[4] and we become cognisant of its signification when we hear the last letter of the word. On hearing the last letter " w," we recollect the previous ones, c, o, and grasp the whole word by the mind; and we cognise the object by means of the conventional association between the word and the object.[5]

The relation between the word and its meaning is not due to nature, but to convention, and this view is confirmed by our experience of the way in which we acquire a knowledge of the meanings of words. We get to know the meanings of words through popular usage, grammar, dictionaries; and

[1] Cp. Vijñānabhikṣu on S.S., v. 37. The grammarians Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (*Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa*, p. 243) and Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa (*Mañjūṣā*, pp. 23–26) regard this signifying power as residing exclusively in words, while the Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta maintain that it resides in objects also. *Pañcadaśī*, viii. 4–15; *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, pp. 10–11.

[2] Pāṇini's reference to sphoṭāyana in vi. 1. 123 indicates that the theory prevailed in his times. See S.D.S., Pāṇinidarśana.

[3] Deussen identifies the sphoṭa with the notion. Thibaut regards it as a grammatical fiction, and is certain that it cannot be a notion, since it is distinctly called a vācaka or abhidhāyaka, and is said to be the cause of the conception of the sense of the word (Thibaut's E.T. of S.B., p 204 n.) See also S.B., i. 3. 28.

[4] Śaktam padam (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, 59).

[5] N.V., ii. 2. 55.

the Vedānta mentions gesture as well.[1] The convention that such and such a word should mean such and such an object is established by God (Īśvarasaṁketaḥ).[2] Later Nyāya admits that men also establish conventions (icchāmātraṁ śaktiḥ),[3] though the latter are styled pāribhāṣika, since they vary with different people.

What is the import of words, an individual (vyakti), or form (ākṛti), or genus (jāti), or all these ?[4] The individual is that which has a definite form (mūrti) and is the abode of particular qualities.[5] It is manifested and perceptible.[6] The form is the peculiar properties ; the collocation of the dewlap is the form of the cow. The genus is the type or class, the general notion underlying the object of a class. It helps us to attain a comprehensive knowledge of things similar to the individual in question.[7] The Nyāya holds that a word denotes all the three, the individual, its form and its genus, though in different degrees.[8] In practice we refer to the form. When our interest is in distinction, the word refers to the individual ; and, when we try to convey the general idea, we refer to the genus. The word suggests the form, denotes the individual and connotes the genus. There is no such thing as a pure indeterminate attribute. It is determined in some way (avacchinna). Again, form by itself is not enough. A clay model of the cow is not treated as a cow, though it has the form, since it is lacking in the generic qualities. Popular usage supports the theory that words denote individuals.[9]

[1] *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, 81 ; *Nyāyamāñjari*, p. vi.

[2] N.B., ii. 1. 55. See also *Nyāyamāñjari*, p. 243.

[3] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 59. *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, 81.

[4] N.S., ii. 2. 56. [5] ii. 2. 64. [6] ii. 2. 65.

[7] Samānaprasavātmikā jātiḥ (N.B., ii. 2. 66). Since we have a definite conception of cowness apart from the idea of individual cows, there must be an objective basis for the former (N.B., ii. 2. 61 and 66). Uddyotakara holds that the class nature subsists in each individual by way of inherence, or samavāya. The question whether the genus subsists in its entirety or in parts in each individual is meaningless, since jāti is not a composite and the distinction of whole and part is inapplicable to it. Jāti, or the eternal essence, is said to be in a necessary relation of samavāya to the individuals whose essence it is and in indirect or temporal relation (kālikasaṁbandha) to the other individuals.

[8] ii. 2. 63. Jātiviśiṣṭavyakti. [9] ii. 2. 57.

Words, according to the Buddhist thinkers, do not represent positive objects, but simply exclude others erroneously recalled to mind. The word "cow" denotes the negation (apoha) of objects which are not cows, such as horses, etc. From this exclusion we infer that the word "cow" refers to the object "cow."[1] Uddyotakara criticises the apoha doctrine on the following grounds.[2] We cannot conceive of a negative denotation unless we have previously conceived of a positive one. All negation has a positive basis. Bare negation is meaningless, while every specific negation has a positive implication. Though in the case of two contradictory words the denotation of the one may exclude that of the other, such an exclusion is not possible in the case of a word like "all."[3] Every word denotes something positive which is not exhausted by its distinction from something else.[4]

It is objected that words cannot denote objects, since they do not co-exist with objects, and are present even when the objects are not present, as in a negative judgment "there is no jar here."[5] Vācaspati meets this objection by saying that a word denotes the universal, including all individuals dispersed in time and place, and so refers to individuals present as well as past.[6] Nor can it be said that the word is only an abstract idea, since it cannot signify the different features of the different individuals. The word refers to the distinctive features which are objective. We use words in experience and they lead to success in life. All this would be impossible if the word referred simply to mental images and not to outer objects.[7]

Sometimes, it is said, that we cannot conceive of the relation between the word and the object. The word is an attribute, and the object denoted by it is a substance, and between the two there cannot be the relation of saṁyoga (conjunction). Even if the object denoted be an attribute, this relation is impossible between two attributes.[8]

[1] See *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 303, 306–8, and Pārthasārathi Miśra's *Nyāyaratnākara*. Early Buddhist works do not contain definite information about this view, though it appears in a modified form in the *Apohasiddhi* of Ratnakīrti. For him words denote neither positive objects nor negative ones. The positive meaning is not a consequence of the negation of other objects any more than the negative meaning is the consequence of the positive denotation. The essence of meaning consists in the simultaneous cognition of the positive and the negative sides. All determinate objects have a positive nature which excludes others. This theory is certainly more satisfactory, though it is not easily reconcilable with the general metaphysics of the Buddhists. Nor do the Hindu logicians accept it as the Buddhist view.

[2] N.V., ii. 2. 65.

[3] See Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka*.

[4] *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 311. See also *Nyāyakandalī*, pp. 317–321.

[5] *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, p. 124; V.S., vii. 2. 17.

[6] N.V.T.T., ii. 2. 63.

[7] *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, p. 136; Vidyānanda's *Aṣṭasahasrī*, p. 249.

[8] V.S., vii. 2. 14.

Words are inactive, and conjunction is based on the movement of one of the members of the relation. The word ākāśa and the object ākāśa are both inactive, and there can be no conjunction between them. Nor do we have between a word and its meaning the relation of inherence. Vātsyāyana admits that the relation between the word and its meaning is not of a productive character (prāptilakṣaṇa). The word " fire " does not produce the object of fire.[1] That is why verbal cognition is less distinct than sense-perception.[2] But it is none the less cognition.

A sentence (vākya) is a collection of significant sounds or words. We cognise the constituent words and then their meanings. The cognitions of the words leave behind traces (saṁskāras) which are remembered at the end of the sentence, and then the different meanings are related together in one context. While the ancient Naiyāyikas contend that the chief means (mukhya karaṇam) of verbal cognition is the recollection of objects due to verbal memory, the modern Naiyāyikas argue that the verbal memory is the chief means. The meaning of a sentence depends on (1) ākāṅkṣā, mutual need or interdependence, or the inability of a word to indicate the intended sense in the absence of another word, (2) yogyatā, or compatibility or fitness or the capacity to accord with the sense of the sentence and not render it futile and meaningless, (3) sannidhi, propinquity, juxtaposition or the utterance of words in quick succession without a long pause between one word and another. These insist on the syntactical, logical and phonetical connections of words. A collection of words devoid of interdependence, man, horse and colony, conveys no sense. A sentence like " moisten with fire " (agninā siñcet) conveys no intelligible meaning. Similarly, words uttered at long intervals do not convey any sense. A sentence is made up of words which are interdependent, capable of being construed together and in close juxtaposition. Gangeśa adds a fourth condition, namely, a knowledge of the intention of the speaker. A sentence like " saindhavam ānaya " may mean either " bring the horse " or " bring salt," and we can be sure of its meaning only if we know the mind

[1] N.B. and N.V.T.T., ii. 1. 50–51.

[2] *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, pp 128–130; Kumārila's S.V., v. 11. 6–8 and 10.

of the speaker. Fitness of words to express a definite meaning covers this requirement also.[1] While fitness demands formal consistency, tātparyajñāna, or knowledge of the intention, may be said to imply material compatibility.[2]

Propositions are divided into three classes: command (vidhi), prohibition (niṣedha), explanation (arthavāda).[3] Śabda, when used as a source of knowledge, means āptopadeśa, or the assertion of a reliable person.[4] The āpta, or the reliable person is the specialist in a certain field, " one who, having had direct proof of a certain matter, desires to communicate it to others who thereby understand it." They may be of any caste or race, " ṛṣis, āryas or mlecchas."[5] When a young man is in doubt whether a particular river is fordable or not, the information of an old experienced man of the locality, that it is fordable, is to be trusted.

These trustworthy assertions relate to the visible world (dṛṣṭārtha) or the invisible (adṛṣṭārtha). That quinine cures fever is of the former kind, that we gain heaven by virtue is of the latter. The words of the ṛṣis deal with the latter.[6] Their statements are to be relied on, since their assertions about the verifiable world have been found to be true. The authors of the Vedas are āptas, or reliable persons, since they had an intuitive perception of the truths, love for humanity and the desire to communicate their knowledge.[7]

Later Naiyāyikas, like Udayana and Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa and the Vaiśeṣika thinkers, regard the supreme Īśvara as the eternal author of the Vedas. Udayana sets aside the view that the authoritativeness of the Vedas is to be inferred from their eternality, freedom from defects and acceptance by great saints. At the beginning of new world-epochs there can be no acceptance by saints. The Mīmāṁsaka argument of the eternality of the Vedas is controverted by Udayana, who argues that there is no continuous tradition to indicate eternality,

[1] *Bhāṣāpariccheda.* See also *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, iv.

[2] While the Mīmāṁsakas and the grammarians hold that the words of a sentence centre round the verb, without which they convey no sense, the Naiyāyikas hold that a proposition is but a number of significant words (padasamūha) whose collective meaning is apprehended, whether or not there be a verb in the sentence (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, p. 59; Jhā: *Prabhākara School*, p. 63).

[3] N.S., ii. 1. 63, and *Tarkakaumudī*, p. 17.

[4] i. 1. 7.

[5] N.B., i. 1 7.

[6] N.B., i. 1. 8.

[7] ii. 1. 68.

since such a tradition must have been interrupted at the dissolution of the world which preceded the existing creation. Vātsyāyana, however, accepts the continuity of tradition, in the sense that God at the beginning of every epoch recomposes the Vedas and keeps up the tradition.[1] If the Mīmāṁsakas adduce texts in support of their view, that the Vedas are eternal, and that the ṛṣis are not their authors but only their seers (mantradraṣṭāraḥ), other texts are quoted in support of the Nyāya view of the origin of the Vedas.[2] Besides, the Vedas contain sentences which imply an author.

Objections against the validity of the Vedas, such as those of untruth, contradiction and tautology, are rejected as untenable.[3] Their validity is defended on the ground that their contents form a coherent whole. Acceptance of the Vedas does not mean a resort to blind faith or revelation.

Dignāga contends that śabda is not an independent source of knowledge. When we speak of credible assertion, we mean either that the person who utters it is credible or that the fact that he utters is credible. If it is the former, we have a case of inference; if it is the latter, we have a case of perception.[4] Though śabda is like inference since it conveys the knowledge of an object through its sign, yet the sign here is different from what it is in inference, indicating as it does whether the words come from a reliable person or not.[5] The relation between the sign and the thing signified is natural in inference, while it is conventional in verbal knowledge.[6] If we argue that verbal cognition follows the remembrance of the meanings of words and therefore is inferential, then even doubtful cognition and knowledge by comparison should be regarded as inferential. If a reference to the three periods of time makes verbal cognition inferential, then other forms of reasoning, as tarka, will also be inferential. If it is urged that verbal cognition depends on positive and negative concomitance, to the effect that the word "jar" means the cognition of the object, and there is no cognition of the object where it is not pronounced, then even perception may be regarded as a case of inference, since it is present where the jar is present, and where the jar is absent there is no perception of the jar.[7] Knowledge derived through words is thus different from that gained through perception, inference and comparison.[8]

---

[1] N.B., and N.V.T.T., ii. 1. 68.

[2] Idaṁ sarvam asṛjata ṛco yajūṁṣi sāmāni, etc.

[3] If we perform a sacrifice for the sake of getting a son, and do not get one, the fault may be in the action and not in the Vedic rule. Injunctions such as "offer the oblation after sunrise" or "before" need not be taken as contradicting each other, since they state alternative courses of conduct. There is no useless tautology (N.B., ii. 1. 58–59).

[4] Dignāga, however, accepts the sayings of Buddha as authoritative, See Kumārila's *Tantravārttika*, pp. 169 ff.

[5] N.B., ii. 1. 52.

[6] N.B., ii. 1. 55.

[7] N.V, ii. 1. 49–51.

[8] N.B., ii. 1. 52; N.V., i. 1. 7.

XIII

OTHER FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE

To the four sources of knowledge admitted by the Nyāya, the Mīmāṁsakas add arthāpatti, or presumption, and the Bhāṭṭas and the Vedāntins abhāva, or non-existence. The Paurāṇikas regard tradition and probability also as valid sources of knowledge. The Naiyāyika believes that all forms of knowledge are comprehended by the four pramāṇas.[1]

Aitihya, or tradition, is brought under śabda.[2] If the rumour or tradition is started by a reliable person, then it is as valid as śabda. Arthāpatti, or implication, is getting at a new fact or presuming something (āpatti) on the basis of another fact (arthāt). It is assuming a thing not itself perceived, though implied by another thing perceived or inferred. The fat Devadatta does not eat in the day. The implication is that he eats in the night, since it is impossible for one to be fat if one does not eat at all. The Mīmāṁsakas, who regard it as an independent means of knowledge, view it as a disjunctive hypothetical syllogism.[3] According to Gaṅgeśa, it is an example of a negative inference which establishes the absence of the middle term through the absence of the major. According to the *Bhāṣāparicchedа*, arthāpatti is accomplished through the recognition of a negative relationship between the middle and the major (vyatirekavyāpti).[4] Saṁbhava, or subsumption, where we cognise a part from a whole of which it is a member, is a case of deductive inference. It is strictly numerical inclusion.

Abhāva, or negation, is sometimes mentioned as an inde-

[1] N.B., ii. 1. 19. [2] ii. 2. 2.

[3] See also *Bhāṣāparicchedа*, p. 143.

[4] It may be expressed in two different stages :—

He who does not eat at all is not fat.
This man is fat.
Therefore this man is not one who does not eat at all—*i.e.* he is one who eats.

This is Cesare. The next step is :—

He who eats must do so either by day or by night.
He does not eat by day.
Therefore he eats by night.

pendent pramāṇa. Though the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system admits non-existence as an object of cognition, it does not believe that a special pramāṇa is necessary for its apprehension. We have already seen how existence is an object of perception which is connected with its adhikaraṇa, or locus, by the relation called viśeṣaṇatā (or qualified and qualification). The non-existent thing is of the same order of reality as its locus, which is perceived; otherwise the perception of its absence cannot be implied by the perception of its locus. Absolute negation is inconceivable. The negation which is the object of knowledge is relative.[1]

By means of inference, we can infer the non-existence of things. Abhāva means not mere negation but contrast. It is contrast as between what exists and what does not exist, as when the non-existent rain brings about the cognition of the existence of the connection of the clouds with high winds; since it is only when there is some such obstruction, as the connection of the clouds with high winds, that there is no fall of the raindrops, which would otherwise be there by reason of the force of gravity in the drops.[2] Of two contradictory things, the non-existence of one establishes the existence of the other. The Nyāya logic proceeds on the principle of dichotomous division. The distinction of homogeneous and heterogeneous examples rests on this assumption. Two contradictory judgments cannot both be false, nor can they both be true. A is either B or not B. One or the other of two contradictories must be true since no other course is possible.[3] If we infer the non-existence of a thing from the existence of another, it is only a case of inference.[4] Vātsyāyana says: "At the time the existent thing is cognised, the non-existent thing is not cognised, that is to say there is the non-cognition of the non-existent, only at the time that there is the cognition of the existent. When the lamp illumines and renders visible something that is visible, that which is not seen in the same manner as that visible thing is regarded as non-existent, the mental process being as follows: 'If the

[1] For a different view, see *Śāstradīpikā*, pp. 234 ff.; *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, vi.
[2] N.B., ii. 2. 1.
[3] Parasparavirodhe hi na prakārāntarasthitiḥ (*Kusumāñjali*, iii. 8).
[4] N.B., ii. 2. 2.

thing existed, it would be seen: since it is not seen, it must be concluded that it does not exist.'"[1] Praśastapāda supports this view. "As the appearance of the effect is indicative of the existence of the cause, so is the non-appearance of the effect indicative of the non-existence of the cause."[2] Even by means of śabda, we can have cognition of non-existence.[3]

XIV

Tarka and Vāda

In tarka, or indirect proof, we start with a wrong assumption and show how it leads to absurdities. If the soul were not eternal, it would not be able to experience the fruits of its actions, undergo rebirth or attain release. It is therefore eternal. The admission of a false minor necessitates the admission of a false major.[4] Tarka is a type of inference distinct from other types, since it is not based on any perception. It leads indirectly to right knowledge.[5] Vātsyāyana thinks that it does not give us determinate knowledge, though it tells us that the opposite of a suggested premise is impossible.[6] Uddyotakara argues that the reasoning about the soul does not enable us to say that the soul is beginningless, but only that it should be so.[7] Tarka is not by itself a source of valid knowledge, though it is valuable as suggesting hypotheses.

The older Nyāya admits eleven kinds of tarka, which the modern reduces to five, of which the chief is what we have described, the *reductio ad absurdum*, called pramāṇabādhitārthaprasaṅga. The other four are ātmāśraya, or *ignoratio elenchi*; anyonyāśraya, or mutual dependence; cakrika, or circular reasoning; and anavasthā, or infinite regress. Even the *reductio ad absurdum* is regarded as a case of fallacious reasoning, since it derives a conclusion which is absurd. But when we transcend the error, we arrive at definitive cognition (nirṇaya).[8]

---

[1] N.B., Introduction.

[2] P.P., p. 225. See also V.S., ix. 2. 5; *Nyāyakandalī*, pp. 225–226; and *Kusumāñjalī*, iii. 20, 22 and 26.

[3] Jayanta mentions eleven kinds of anupalabdhi. See *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 56–57.

[4] S.D.S., xi.

[5] Pramānugrāhakas tarkaḥ (S.S.S.S., vi. 25). Tarkabhāsā.

[6] N.B., i. 1. 40.

[7] N.V., i. 1. 40.

[8] i. 1. 41.

Vāda, or discussion, proceeds by means of the free use of syllogisms and aims at the ascertainment of truth. But it often degenerates into mere wrangling (jalpa), which aims at effect or victory and cavil (vitaṇḍā), which delights in criticism for its own sake.[1] Such a futile discussion can be put an end to by convicting the opponent of his error and forcing him to accept defeat.[2]

XV

MEMORY

All knowledge is divided into presentative cognitions (anubhava), which are not reproductions of former states of consciousness, and representative cognition (smṛti), which recall previous experiences into consciousness.[3] If we exclude memory knowledge, the entire past will drop out of the field of certitude. Memory knowledge is based on residual traces (saṁskārajanya). Memory is defined as "due to a peculiar contact of the soul with the manas and the trace left by the previous experience."[4] It is sometimes said to be caused solely by the impression (saṁskāramātrajanya), and thus distinguished from recognition (pratyabhijñā). While the impression is the immediate cause of the recollection, the perception of the identity of the present object with something else is the cause of recognition. The Nyāya does not admit

[1] i. 2. 1–3.

[2] The points of defeat (nigrahasthāna) are of twenty-two different kinds: (1) pratijñāhāni, or surrendering the proposition to be established; (2) pratijñāntara, or shifting the argument by importing new considerations; (3) pratijñāvirodha, or self-contradiction; (4) pratijñāsamnyāsa, or disclaiming the proposition; (5) hetvantara, or shifting the reason; (6) arthāntara, or shifting the topic; (7) nirarthaka, or senseless talking; (8) avijñātārtha, or using unintelligible jargon; (9) apārthaka, or incoherent talk; (10) aprāptakāla, or overlooking the order of argumentation; (11) nyūna, or dropping essential steps of the argument; (12) adhika, or elaborating the obvious; (13) punarukta, or repeating oneself; (14) ananubhāṣaṇa, or keeping quiet; (15) ajñāna, or not understanding the proposition; (16) apratibhā, or wanting in resourceful replies; (17) vikṣepa, or evading the discussion by feigning illness, etc.; (18) matānujña, or admitting the defeat by pointing out that it is also present in the opponent's view; (19) paryanuyogyopekṣaṇa, or overlooking the censurable; (20) niranuyogyānuyoga, or censuring the non-censurable; (21) apasiddhānta, or deviating from an accepted tenet; and (22) hetvābhāsa, or semblance of a reason.

[3] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 34.

[4] V.S., ix. 2. 6.

memory as a separate source of knowledge, since we have in it not any cognitive knowledge of objects, but only a reproduction of a past experience in the same form and order in which it once existed in the past and has now ceased to exist.[1] The validity of remembered knowledge depends on that of the previous experience which is reproduced. Some logicians include remembered knowledge under valid cognition when the latter is defined as knowledge which is not contradicted.[2] Recollections are not simultaneous, since attention (praṇidhāna), perception of the sign and the rest (liṅgādijñāna) are not present at one and the same time.[3]

XVI

Doubt

The state of doubt is said to arise from : (1) the recognition of properties common to many objects, as when we see a tall object in the twilight and are not sure whether it is a man or a post, since tallness is found in both ; (2) the recognition of properties not common to any of the objects, as when we find it difficult to decide whether sound is eternal or not, since it is not found in man or beast, which are non-eternal, or in atoms, which are eternal ; (3) conflicting testimony, as when two competent authorities differ about the nature of the soul ; (4) irregularity of perception, as when we see water and are not sure whether it is real, as in a tank, or unreal, as in a

[1] *N.S. Vṛtti*, i. 1. 3.

[2] *Tarkakaumudī*, p. 7.

[3] N.S., iii. 2. 33; N.B., iii. 2. 25–30; N.V., iii. 2. 25–26. Among the causes of recollection are mentioned: (1) praṇidhāna, or attention; (2) nibandha, or association; (3) abhyāsa, or repetition; (4) liṅga, or sign; (5) lakṣaṇa, or descriptive sign; (6) sādṛśya, or similarity; (7) parigraha, or ownership; (8) āśrayāśṛtasaṁbandha, or the relation of correlatives; (9) ānantarya, or immediate sequence; (10) viyoga, or separation; (11) ekakārya, or identity of function ; (12) virodha, or enmity ; (13) atiśaya, or superiority ; (14) prāpti, or acquisition ; (15) vyavadhāna, or intervention ; (16) sukhaduḥkha, or pleasure-pain ; (17) icchādveṣa, or desire and aversion ; (18) bhaya, or fear ; (19) arthitva, or need ; (20) kriyā, or action ; (21) rāga, or affection ; (22) dharma, or merit ; (23) adharma, or demerit. These, according to Vātsyāyana, are only suggestive and by no means exhaustive. Nidarśanaṁ cedaṁ smṛtihetūnāṁ na parisaṁkhyānam iti (N.B., iii. 2. 41). All the causes of the association and recall of ideas can be brought under these heads.

mirage, since it is perceived in both; (5) irregularity of non-perception, which is the converse of the preceding.[1] According to Uddyotakara, the two last do not by themselves cause doubt, unless there is the perception of common inconclusive features. Since the element perceived is associated with more than one object, it revives simultaneously two chains of ideas, between which the mind oscillates and the state of doubt arises.[2] Neither idea is integrated with the percept, though both are alternately suggested.[3] The state of doubt is unpleasantly toned and it arrests all activity.[4]

If one of the alternatives is suppressed, and the mind is inclined towards another, we have a case of ūha, or conjecture, where we tentatively accept an alternative.[5] The suppression of one alternative is due to the strength of the other. If in a rice field we see a tall object, we conjecture that it is a tall man and not a tall post, since posts are not often met with in rice fields. While in the state of doubt, the two alternatives are equally probable; in that of ūha, one becomes more probable than the other.

Another kind of doubtful state is mentioned, called anadhyavasāya, due to lapse of memory. We perceive a tree, but forget its name, and so ask "what may its name be?"[6] According to Śivāditya, we have here also two alternative suggestions, though they are not present to consciousness. If we become conscious of them, we have a state of doubt. Praśastapāda, Śrīdhara and Udayana give a different account. It is said to be an indefinite perception of an object, either familiar or unfamiliar, due to absent-mindedness or desire for further knowledge. When a familiar object passes by

[1] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 64. V.S., ii. 2. 17.

[2] Dolāyamānā pratītiḥ saṁśayaḥ (Guṇaratna's *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya-vṛtti*).

[3] Laugākṣi Bhāskara defines the state of doubt as knowledge consisting in an alternation between various contradictory attributes. *Tarkakaumudī:* Ekasmin dharmiṇi viruddhanānākoṭikaṁ jñāmam, p. 7. Cp. also *Tarka-saṁgraha*, 64; *Bhāṣāpariccheda*, 129–130.

[4] Praśastapāda distinguishes two kinds of doubt, internal and external (P.P., p. 174).

[5] *Saptapadārthī*, 68.

[6] See *Saptapadārthī*, p. 69. Cp. *Mitabhāṣiṇī*, Vizianagram skt series, p. 26: kim saṁjñako 'yam ity atrāpi, cūtaḥ panaso vety, vikalpasphuraṇād anadhya-vasāyopi, saṁśaya eva.

and we fail to notice it owing to absent-mindedness or inattention, we have a case of anadhyavasāya, where we know that something passed, though we do not know what it is that passed. When the object is unfamiliar and we do not know its name, we have a state of imperfect knowledge, which is distinct from the state of ordinary doubt.[1]

Doubt is the impetus to investigation, for it creates a desire for what is not cognised. It precedes inference, though not perception or verbal knowledge. Doubt ends when our knowledge becomes precise. Doubt is not to be confused with error So long as we know that we do not know the nature of the object for certain, we have true knowledge or pratyaya. Doubt is incomplete knowledge, while error is false knowledge.

XVII

Fallacies

The logic of the Nyāya elaborates the principles by which we acquire knowledge. It adopts the standpoint of natural science, and its laws are not precepts of conduct, but general statements based on the observation of the means by which man satisfies his intellectual needs Normally, knowledge is valid; error is adventitious and arises when the conditions under which right cognition is produced fail. Fallacies occur when the normal working of the cognitive powers is interfered with. The Nyāya deals at great length with fallacies; and it is not surprising, if we remember that liability of thought to error calls logic into existence.

A good deal of attention is paid to jugglery with words, since logic aims at protecting us from the arts of the sophist. Three kinds of verbal quibbling (chala) are distinguished: (1) Vākchala. An ambiguous term is used and the person spoken to takes it in a sense different from that intended by the speaker. When one says, "This boy is a navakambala," possessed of a new blanket (or nine blankets), the quibbler replies, "No, he has not nine blankets, but only one." (2) Sāmānyachala. A statement made with reference to a particular is extended to the whole class. When one says, "this Brahmin has learning and conduct," the quibbler objects that not all Brahmins possess learning and conduct. (3) Upacārachala. Here a figurative

[1] P.P., pp. 182–183.

expression is taken literally. When one says, " the scaffolds cry out," the quibbler objects that inanimate objects like scaffolds cannot be expected to cry out.

Fallacies such as jāti and nigrahasthāna relate to dialectic more than to logic. Logical fallacies occur in connection with the different members of the syllogistic argument. The fallacies of the minor term, pakṣābhāsas, of the example, dṛṣṭāntābhāsas, are not so important as the hetvābhāsas, or fallacies of the middle term. Gautama[1] mentions five kinds of these: (1) Savyabhicāra, or the inconclusive, leading to more conclusions than one. From the ground of intangibility we may conclude either the eternality or the non-eternality of sound, since both eternal atoms and non-eternal cognitions are intangible. The middle term is not pervaded by the major. As the middle term is not uniformly concomitant with any one alternative, it is called anaikāntika in later logic. Three subdivisions of these are admitted, namely, (*a*) sādhāraṇa, or the common, where the middle term is too wide; (*b*) asādhāraṇa, or the uncommon, where the middle term is too narrow; (*c*) anupasaṁhārin, or the indefinite, where the middle term cannot be verified.[2] (2) Viruddha, or the contradictory, is the reason which contradicts the proposition to be established.[3] (3) Prakaraṇasama, or the equivalent to the proposition, leads to no conclusion, since it raises the question which it is intended to answer. It puts forward one of two contrary characters, both of which are equally unperceived.[4] Later logic brings it under satpratipakṣa. It is also taken as a reason which is available for both sides when it becomes identical with savyabhicāra.[5] (4) Sādhyasama gives a reason which is not different from what is to be proved and itself requires proof. It is a case of the unproved or the asiddha, of which different kinds are admitted: (*a*) svarūpāsiddhi, where the nature of the middle is absolutely unknown, as when we say sound is eternal because it is visible, where the visibility of sound is something absolutely unknown; (*b*) āśrayāsiddhi, where the middle has no basis, as in the example, " there is no God since he has no body," where bodylessness has no substratum if there were no God; (*c*) anyathāsiddhi, or that which is otherwise known.[6] (5) Kālātīta, or the mistimed, is the reason adduced when the time is past. The argument that "sound is durable

[1] i. 2. 4. See also V.S., iii. 1. 15. Praśastapāda mentions asiddha, or unproved; viruddha, or opposed; saṁdigdha, or doubtful; and anadhyavasita, or unascertained (P.P., pp. 239–240). Dignāga mentions fourteen kinds, and Bhāsarvajña six. See also *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 52.

[2] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 53. See also Viśvanātha's *N.S. Vṛtti*, i. 2. 46.

[3] N.V., i. 2. 6. Vātsyāyana (i. 2. 6) gives an example from the *Yogabhāṣya* (iii. 13) to the effect that the two statements that (1) the world ceases from manifestation because it is not eternal, and (2) it continues to exist because it cannot be destroyed. See also *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 54.

[4] N.B. and N.V., i. 2. 7.

[5] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 55.

[6] Vācaspati adds ekadeśāsiddhi, and Udayana adds vyāpyatvāsiddhi where the concomitance is not known to be invariable.

because it is manifested by union as a colour," is an example of this fallacy. The colour of the jar is manifested when the latter comes into union with a lamp, though it existed before the union took place, and will continue to exist after the union has ceased. To argue on the analogy of colour that sound existed before the union of the drum and the stick, and will continue to exist after the union has ceased, is fallacious. The reason adduced is said to be mistimed, since sound is produced immediately after the union of the drum and the stick, while colour is manifested simultaneously with the union of the jar and the lamp. This fallacy is also called bādhita, where the middle term asserts something the opposite of which is ascertained to be true by other evidence. In later logic the list of fallacies is considerably developed.

XVIII

Truth

The fact from which a theory of knowledge starts, is not that we have knowledge, but that we claim to have it. The task of the epistemologist is to investigate how far the claim can be sustained. In the theory of pramā, or truth, the Naiyāyika sets out to inquire how far the claim which we implicitly grant is justified. He tries to show that the content of knowledge we acquire by means of the four pramāṇas has validity or normative necessity.

The Nyāya theory of knowledge comes into conflict with the scepticism of the Mādhyamika doctrine, which holds that we do not know the essence of things, and our thought is so contradictory that it cannot be regarded as real. Against this, Vātsyāyana urges that if the Mādhyamika is certain that nothing exists, he allows the possibility of certainty to that extent at least and thus contradicts himself. If, however, there is no proof for the contention that nothing exists, if it is but an unwarranted assumption, then its opposite may be assumed. Again, he who denies the validity of the pramāṇas does so on the basis of some pramāṇa or on no basis. If the latter, the argument is useless; if the former, the validity of the pramāṇa is accepted. Radical scepticism is unworkable. Everyone admits the principles of knowledge the moment he begins to think. Again, he who admits the functioning of thought must admit also the world of reality, for thought and reality are interdependent. Vātsyāyana says: "If an

analysis of things by thought is possible, then it is not true that the real nature of things is not apprehended; if, on the other hand, the real nature of things is not apprehended, then there can be no analysis of things by thought. So that to allege that 'there is analysis of things by thought and the real nature of things is not apprehended' involves a contradiction in terms."[1] Uddyotakara paraphrases it thus: "If there can be analysis of things by thought, then things cannot be non-existent; and if things are non-existent, then there can be no analysis of things by thought."[2] The Nyāya believes that knowledge is significant of reality (arthavat).[3]

Vātsyāyana attacks the Vijñānavada view, that the objects of experience are mere strings of presentations. Things seen in dreams are refuted as unreal, since they are not experienced in waking consciousness. If there were not a sensible world of experience, dream states could not exist. The diversity of dreams can be traced to the diversity of their causes.[4] If there were not an existent reality, the difference between truth and error would be negligible, and there would be no explanation for the obvious facts that we cannot control our perceptions and have them at our pleasure.[5] Nor is the Naiyāyika satisfied with the view that postulates objects, though of a momentary character. If the objects are the causes of our cognition, they must precede the effect. But, on the view of momentariness, the object which has produced the cognition has ceased to be in the next moment when it is

[1] N.B, iv. 2. 27.

[2] N.V., iv. 2. 27.

[3] The impossibility of certain knowledge is based by the Mādhyamikas on the ground, among others, that perception can be neither prior to nor posterior to nor simultaneous with the objects of sense. If it is prior, then it cannot be the result of the contact of sense with its object; if it is posterior, then it cannot be said that the object of sense is established by perception. If perception were simultaneous with its object, then there need not be any order of succession in our cognitions, since there is no such order in their corresponding objects. Colour and smell can be perceived at the same time, which the Nyāya does not admit. What is true of perception applies to the other pramāṇas and their relation to prameya, or objects of knowledge as well. So these means of knowledge are both invalid and impossible. This objection against perceptual knowledge is set aside on the ground that the means of knowledge may precede its object as a drum precedes its sound, succeed as an illumination succeeds the sun, or are simultaneous with it as smoke synchronises with fire (N.B., ii. 1. 8–19).

[4] N.B., iv. 2. 33–34 and 37.

[5] N.B., iv. 2. 26–37.

perceived; and this cannot be allowed, since perception is only of what is immediately present. To argue that the disappearance of the object synchronises with the emergence of perception, is of no avail, since we perceive the object as present and not as past. Even inference would be impossible [1] Again, cause and effect, being related to each other as container and contained, must exist at the same time. The fundamental character of that which really is, as distinct from that which is only imagined to be, is found in its independence of all relation to the experience of a subject. What exists at all, exists equally whether it is experienced or not. Experience is a relation of one-sided dependence. For it to exist, things are necessary; but for things to exist, no experience is necessary. Thus the Naiyāyika concludes that our ideas submit to an objective standard of facts relatively independent of the subject's will and purpose.[2] The existence of things does not depend on pramāṇas, though their existence as objects of cognition depends entirely on the operation of the pramāṇas.

Pramāṇas are so called because they give us pramā.[3] Udayana in his *Tātparyapariśuddhi* says: " Cognition of the real nature of things is pramā, and the means of such knowledge is pramāṇa." [4] What is the real nature (tattvam) of things? " It is nothing else but being or existence in the case of that which is and non-being or non-existence in the case of that which is not.[5] That is to say, when something that is, is apprehended as being or existent, so that it is apprehended as what it really is (yathābhūtam) and not as something of a contrary nature (aviparītam), then, that which is thus apprehended constitutes the true nature of the thing: and analogously when a nonentity is apprehended as such, *i.e.* as what is not, as something of a contrary nature

[1] See N.V., i. 1. 37; iii. 2. 14. Uddyotakara observes: " In the syllogism, 'sound is non-eternal, because it is a product like a pot,' pot, the instance, must contain non-eternality and productibility, and the former is posterior non-existence, the latter prior non-existence. How can the two coexist in a pot, if it is but momentary? "

[2] N.B.; Viśvanātha: *N.S. Vṛtti*, iv. 2. 26 ff.

[3] Pra, valid; mā, knowledge (iv. 2. 29).

[4] Yathārthānubhavaḥ pramā, tatsādhanaṁ ca pramāṇam.

[5] Sataś ca sadbhāvo 'sataś cāsadbhāvaḥ. N.B., i. 1. 1.

—then, that which is thus apprehended constitues the true nature of the thing."[1] Apramā, bhrama, or mithyājñāna, is the knowledge of a thing as it is not. It is that in which the thing is apprehended as what it is not,[2] as when we mistake the shell for silver. It is not mere absence of knowledge but positive error.[3]

Interrogation, doubt and the like have a place in the mental history of the individual, though the question of truth and falsity does not arise with regard to them. Judgment or assertion of a content, regardless of the person asserting, is the object of logical evaluation. All knowledge is of the form of judgment where we have in the subject the viśeṣya, or the qualified and in the predicate, the viśeṣaṇa, or the qualification. In the Nyāya the judgment is analysed, not so much into subject and predicate as into substantive and adjective, the substantive being that which is characterised and the adjective that which characterises.[4] All knowledge consists in comprehending the nature and qualities of objects. The subject tells us that a certain thing exists and the predicate determines further the nature of the given by specifying its properties. Where the determinations agree with the nature of the object, we have truth, or yathārtha.[5] Every subject has some character in reality, and thought distinguishes the substantive and the adjective, and asserts that the two are found united in the world of reality.

[1] N.B. and N.V., i. 1. 1.

[2] N.B., i. 1. 4.

[3] N.B., iv. 2 1; iv. 2. 35.

[4] Cp. "We find that in every proposition we are determining in thought the character of an object presented to thought to be thus determined. In the most fundamental sense, then, we may speak of a determinandum and a determinans; the determinandum is defined as what is presented to be determined or characterised by thought or cognition: the determinans as what does characterise or determine in thought that which is given to be determined" (W. E. Johnson: *Logic*, i. p. 9).

[5] Tadvati tatprakārako'nubhavo yathārthaḥ, tadabhāvavati tatprakarako'nubhavo, 'yathārthaḥ (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, 35). Prakāra is the name of the predicate, while the quality of the real denoted by the predicate is called viśeṣaṇa. Prakāra refers to the cognition and viśeṣaṇa to the object. Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa raises the difficulty whether in the judgment, "jarness is in the jar," jarness can be regarded as substantive and "jar" as an adjective, and answers it by saying that the predicate need not always be an attribute but should only be related to the subject. Tadvati means tatsaṁbandhavati. See also N.V., iii. 2. 42.

Pramāṇas are said to give us a knowledge of objects as they really are.[1]

The relation between the object, jar, and our knowledge of the object, is not one of inherence (samavāya); for the knowledge pertaining to the object "jar" (ghaṭaviṣayakajñāna) is a quality (guṇa) of the self and not of the jar. Nor is it one of conjunction (saṁyoga), for this relation holds only between substances, while knowledge is a quality. Yet there must be some relation between the object and the knowledge of the object, in order that the particular judgment and not any other should result. Hence the only possible determining cause (niyāmaka) of our judgment is the nature of the jar itself (ghaṭasvarūpa). This relation is called svarūpasaṁbandha, which is defined in Bhīmācārya's *Nyāyakośa* as "the relation which must be held to exist in a case where determinate knowledge or judgment (viśiṣṭajñāna) could not have been effected by any other relation (samavāya or saṁyoga)."[2] It is a relation *sui generis* between the object and the cognition.[3] The effect of knowledge, as distinct from the act or the process of knowledge, is neither the physical object in itself nor a merely mental state, it is the essence, or svarūpa, or character, the what of the object known.[4] If the object of knowledge in outer perception is the physical existent itself, then there can be no possibility of error. Everyone's account of the object must be true. It is at variance with the facts to hold that when we think of the North Pole, it actually gets into

[1] Pramāṇasya sakalapadārthavyavasthāpakatvam (Viśvanātha's *N.S. Vṛtti*, i. 1. 1).

[2] Saṁbandhāntareṇa viśiṣṭapratītijananāyogyatvam. The obvious objection to making the jar itself a saṁbandha, namely, that the distinction between the relation and the related thing is obliterated, is met by the fact that the jar as the jar is not the saṁbandha, but only the jar as the object of knowledge.

[3] Avacchedakatva is a case of svarūpasambandha. In some cases it is the essential constitutive attribute of the individual which is non-existent. In the case of ghatābhāva or absence of the jar, jarness is avacchedaka. Where there are both simple and complex attributes, the simpler attribute is the avacchedaka. Where the attribute is coextensive with the instances, we have a case of anatiriktavṛttitva. The relation between knowledge and the object known is viṣayatā.

[4] Cp. "Our data are simply character complexes, essences, logical entities, which are irresistibly taken to be the characters of the existents perceived or otherwise known" (*Essays in Critical Realism*, p. 5).

Later Naiyāyikas, like Vācaspati and Udayana, admit the self-evident character (svataḥprāmāṇyam) of some forms of valid knowledge. Inference free from all error and inconsistency and comparison (upamāna) based on essential resemblance are, according to Vācaspati, of self-evident validity, since there is rational necessity binding the cognition and the objects. In the case of sense-perception and verbal testimony, we cannot be equally certain.[1] Udayana admits Vācaspati's contention, and argues that besides inference and comparison, self-consciousness (anuvyavasāya) and internal as well as external perception of mere existence (dharmijñāna) possess self-evident validity.[2]

XIX

Error

Pramā, or valid knowledge, is distinguished from doubt (saṁśaya) and erroneous knowledge (viparyaya), where the ideas do not lead to successful action. Illusions and hallucinations fail to realise their ends, *i.e.* do not fulfil the expectations roused by them. We become conscious of error when the demands of our ideal past are not met by the present. We see a white object and take it to be silver, pick it up and find it to be a piece of shell. The new experience of the shell contradicts the expectation of silver. According to the Nyāya, all error is subjective. Vātsyāyana says: "What is set aside by true knowledge is the wrong apprehension, not the object."[3] Uddyotakara observes, taking the mirage as an instance, "the object all the while remains what it actually is: In regard to the flickering rays of the sun, when there arises the cognition of water, there is no error in the object: it is not that the rays are not rays, nor that the flickering is not flickering: the error lies in the cognition: as it is the cognition which instead of appearing as the cognition of the flickering rays, appears as the cognition of water, *i.e.* as the cognition of a thing as something which it is not."[4] Water is not absolutely non-existent, as a flower in the sky, but is not existent here and now, though it is imagined to exist. The rays are the cause of the illusion, though not the object of

[1] N.V.T.T., i. 1. 1.

[2] For a searching criticism of the Nyāya theory of truth, see *Khaṇḍana*, i. 13–14.

[3] N.B., iv. 2. 35.

[4] N.V., i. 1. 4.

the illusory perception of water. The realism of the Nyāya is here slightly modified, since it cannot account for the rise of illusions on the view that the world of experienced things with all their peculiar qualities exists independently of any relation to the experiencing subject. All erroneous cognition has some basis in reality. Vātsyāyana says: "No wrong apprehension is entirely baseless." [1] Error is the apprehension of an object as other than what it is. This view of anyathākhyāti is supported not only by the Nyāya but also by the Jaina logicians, and Kumārila.

The Naiyāyikas repudiate other theories of error,[2] which are more metaphysical than logical. The Sautrāntikas hold that in error there is a wrong superposition (āropa) of something which is a form of cognition (jñānākāra) on an external object. The Yogācāras do not admit extra-mental realities, yet for all practical purposes objects are admitted to be real, thanks to the tendencies of beginningless avidyā. Error consists in the superposition of the form of cognition on such objects.[3] We know that a cognition is erroneous, since it is sublated by another apprehension [4] and is devoid of practical efficiency (arthakriyākāritva). In the apprehension "this is silver," what is sublated is not silver but thisness (idantā), for, in the judgment a form of cognition "silver" is attributed to the "this"; in the sublative judgment "this is not silver," we sublate the "this" and not the "silver," for, to deny the latter is to deny its existence as a form of cognition. This is the view of Jñānākārakhyāti, according to which a form of cognition is wrongly referred to an external object. When the illusion is off, the external reference of silver is denied. This view is a corollary from the general metaphysical position of the Yogācāras, that there is no real difference between the self, the object of knowledge and knowledge. The Naiyāyika objects that, on the Yogācāra view, our cognitions should take the form of not "this is silver" but "I am silver," which is not the case. The Yogācāras cannot account for the distinction between truth and error. Subjectivism vitiates the whole position. Sweetness is in the honey and bitterness in the gall, and these qualities are not purely imaginary. The Nyāya formula, that error is the apprehension of a thing as what it is not, is applicable even on the Yogācāra view.[5] The Mādhyamikas hold the asatkhyāti view, that there is only non-being (asat), and that all perception of internal and external objects is erroneous. Non-existent silver manifests itself as existent, thanks to our cognitive mechanism. The

---

[1] N.B., iv. 2. 35.

[2] N.V.T.T., i. 1. 2.

[3] Anādyavidyāvāsanāropitamalīkam bāhyam, tatra jñānākārasyāropaḥ (*Bhāmatī*, i. 1. 1).

[4] *Bhāmatī*. Balavad bādhakapratyayavaśāt.

[5] Aniruddha on S.P.S., i. 42; *Nyāyamañjarī*, p. 178

Naiyāyika objects that the incorrect apprehension of silver in a shell is produced not by nothing but by something in the piece of shell. If illusions are not excited by external stimuli and have no objective basis, we cannot distinguish one illusion from another. A non-existent thing cannot produce any effect. Erroneous cognitions cannot be traced to residual impressions which are not possible without real objects.[1] The Advaita adopts the anirvacanīyakhyāti. Whatever is manifested in a cognition is the object of that cognition. In the illusion of silver, silver appears to consciousness and is cognised; otherwise we shall have no reason to say that it is the illusion of silver and not of something else. But the silver so cognised is neither real nor unreal nor both real and unreal. If real, the cognition would be valid; if unreal, no activity will be induced; if both unreal and real, then two contradictory qualities will subsist in one and the same entity. Its nature is really indefinable or anirvacanīya. This inexplicable silver is produced through avidyā with the help of residual traces of the past cognitions of silver revived by the perception of the similarity of silver with the object with which the defective sense-organ is in contact. According to the Advaita, the illusion is a presentative cognition produced by an object actually present to consciousness. Silver is present at the time and place when and where the illusion is produced. Otherwise the illusion is not a presentation. This presented silver lasts as long as the illusion lasts. The Naiyāyika objects that, if the illusory object of silver is created in the absence of silver, then we could see anything of which we have an idea, and there could be no difference between image and percept. The Naiyāyika, however, congratulates himself on the fact that this view can be brought under his anyathākhyāti, since an indefinable object appears to consciousness as real.[2] Akhyāti (or vivekākhyāti), or non-discrimination, is the name given to Prābhākara's view of error. The difference between the piece of shell we see and the silver we imagine is not noticed, and we say "this is silver." The sublating cognition does not contradict the illusion, but simply recognises the distinction between the perceived and the remembered elements of the erroneous cognition. Against this view, the Nyāya urges that, as long as the illusion lasts, there is an actual presentation or perception of silver, and not a mere representation. We are conscious of silver as something presented to consciousness here and now, and not as something

---

[1] If illusions are not produced by external objects, then there is no difference between dreamless sleep and illusions except that in the latter we have consciousness and in the former not. *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, pp. 13 ff.; *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 177–178.

[2] Rāmānuja, criticising the Advaita view, asks, What is the cause of the production of the indefinable silver at the time of the illusion? The cognition of silver cannot produce the object, since the latter is the cause of the former. It cannot be due to a defect in the sense-mechanism, since the sense-organs do not produce effects in the outward objects. Senses cause knowledge and not objects of knowledge.

perceived in the past and remembered now. Non-discrimination at the time of the illusion cannot induce action. The nature of obscuration of memory (smṛtipramoṣa) is not clearly stated. So it must be said that our immediate perceptual consciousness is itself infected with error.[1]

The Nyāya theory of anyathākhyāti is criticised by the other schools, notably the Advaita Vedānta.[2] Silver existing at some other time and place cannot be an object of perception, since it is not present to the senses. If it is said to be recalled to consciousness, then even in inference of fire from smoke, fire may be said to be recalled to consciousness, and there would be no need for inference at all. Again, to what does the otherwiseness (anyathātva) refer? It cannot refer to the cognitive activity, where the substratum shell cannot impart its own form to a cognition which apprehends silver; not to the result of the cognitive activity, since a presentation does not differ essentially whether it is valid or invalid; not to the object of cognition which is the shell, which cannot identify itself with or transform itself into silver. If the shell is absolutely different from silver, then it cannot be identified with it; if it is both different and not different, then even judgments like "the cow is shorthorned" would be illusory. If the shell actually transforms itself into silver, then the cognition of silver is not invalid and cannot be sublated. If it is said that it is a momentary transformation for the time the illusion lasts, then the perception of silver must be had even by those who do not suffer from any sense defects.[3]

XX

GENERAL ESTIMATE OF NYĀYA EPISTEMOLOGY

The Nyāya view of knowledge as an attribute of the soul, which copies reality, seems to common sense too simple to need

[1] Jayasiṁhasūri mentions the theory of alaukikārthakhyāti, which Jayanta attributes to a Mīmāṁsaka. According to it, in the illusory cognition of silver, the object of the illusion is silver, which is different from the ordinary (laukika) silver. What serves our practical needs is laukika, and what does not is alaukika. Even alaukika silver induces some activity. The Naiyāyika asks whether we have any knowledge of alaukika silver and what becomes of it the moment we realise our mistake. Prabhācandra, in his *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, mentions prasiddhārthakhyāti as the view supported by Bhāskara and the followers of the Sāṁkhya. According to it, the object of illusory cognition is not a non-existent thing, but an existent object established by knowledge. Water is the object of the illusion of water, and when this illusory cognition is contradicted by the cognition of the rays of the sun, the latter cognition has for its object the rays of the sun. This view is not satisfactory, since it makes all cognitions valid (*Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 187–188; *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, i)

[2] See *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, 1. [3] *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṁgraha*, p. 33.

any justification; yet this apparently innocent view involves assumptions that have been uncritically accepted. In its hostility to Buddhist subjectivism the Nyāya insists that things are the ground of logical truth, that the external world exists apart from our knowledge of it and determines that knowledge, that our ideas correspond to things. It divides the real into two compartments of subjects and objects, and thus transforms the ordinary assumptions of common sense into a metaphysical theory which is inadequate to the facts of consciousness as well as the demands of logic. The main assumptions which vitiate the epistemology of the Nyāya are: (1) that self and not-self are sharply separated from one another, (2) that consciousness is the result of the causal action of the not-self on the self, (3) that knowledge is a property of the self. In spite of these metaphysical prejudices, the Nyāya contains fruitful suggestions by which its defects may be overcome. So long as the Nyāya gives an account of what is immediately experienced in the act of knowledge, it is on secure ground; but when it tries to offer a metaphysical explanation, in terms which take us behind the ultimate fact of knowledge, it is open to criticism. That we have a direct awareness of the world which is not a mere putting together of abstract particulars but a complex cosmos with terms and relations, particulars and universals, that our ideas have working value, are views warranted by experience. The fundamental mistake of the Nyāya is the mistake of Locke, and other empirical thinkers who regard the individual as one natural unit and the world as another. This mechanical view, however legitimate for the limited purposes of daily life and psychology, is not ultimately defensible. The problem for logic is not so much the genesis of knowledge as its nature. We cannot hope to determine the nature of knowledge by trying to go behind it and observe the manner of its coming to be. When the Naiyāyika regards consciousness as a product or a resultant, he is trying to get behind the process of knowing.

If the self and the not-self are sharply separated from one another, and if consciousness is but the result of the causal action of the not-self on the self, as Locke and Descartes, Hume and Kant thought, then all the contents of conscious-

ness are purely subjective states of the knowing individual. Events of the world of not-self cannot form part of the knowledge which belongs to the self; and if knowledge reproduces reality, it can only contain copies of real events and not the events themselves. When we divide the subject from the object, the question of building the bridge from the one to the other becomes difficult. Either we have to hold that the object is the creation of the subject or that there is no object at all. Whether we say that the object is taken into consciousness, or is mirrored in it, or represented by a sketch or an outline, whatever view of the relation of knowledge to object we may adopt, it becomes impossible for us to be certain that the world is as we perceive it. So long as the two are external to each other, as one piece of matter is external to another, we can never be sure that our ideas correctly represent objects, or that they represent objects at all. We cannot compare our cognitions with reality, since the latter is external to thought. Nothing but thought itself is known directly, and we cannot compare the thought with the real, since only one of the terms is given, and the act of comparison implies that both the terms should be given. If anything can compare the idea on the one side and the object on the other, it must be consciousness[1]; but such a consciousness must include both the idea and the object.

If truth means agreement of ideas with reality, and if reality is defined as that which is external to thought, what is not and cannot be in thought or made up of thought, then truth-seeking is a wild-goose chase. Thought seeks an end which could never conceivably be attained, nay, an end of which no clear notion could be formed. The Naiyāyika faces the conclusion that the goal of thought, *i.e.* the attainment of truth, cannot be directly realised. He holds that for a finite mind the goal of thought is beyond attainment. We have to be content with the lower ideal of acquiring confidence in the working value of our ideas. Serviceability or

[1] Professor Alexander holds that consciousness and reality are independent things, and the relation between them is that of compresence. The two happen to be together, though they are separate in the world. But what is the nature of this consciousness? Consciousness is always of something, and it does not tell us about the existence of an object outside and independent of it.

practical efficiency generates this feeling of confidence. This workability does not, however, justify the Nyāya assumption that ideas work because they are in accord with reality.[1] The Buddhist logicians who adopt the same test of truth derive a different conclusion from it; and it must be said that the Buddhist view is more logical. The content of truth is not correspondence of knowledge with objects which are but ideal, but verification by experience.[2] Ideas prompt us to activity, and when we realise our desires their claim to truth is granted. Our dreams are declared to be illusory, since activities based on them fail to achieve the ends. Suppose we dream something, dig up our field and light on a treasure, then our dream is true, whether or not it accords with reality. It is clear that the best grounded and the most certain of our knowledge has a possibility of error. No belief of ours is so firmly grounded that there does not remain at least a bare chance of its being false. While it is possible to lead some sort of existence, depending on this pragmatic test, we cannot have complete satisfaction. What serves one need may not serve another; and we are interested in the vital logical need to know reality, which cannot be met The Nyāya, which is anxious to save us from Buddhist subjectivism, has not provided us with a more satisfactory view of reality. When the patent fact of our knowledge of the external world is not accounted for by the Nyāya theory, it must return upon its initial assumptions and examine them in the light of the analysis of the fact of knowledge itself.

While it is quite true that things may be real without being consciously present to my or your experience and do not begin to exist when you or I become aware of them, still it cannot be said that real existence is independent of all experience. The relation between knowledge and its object is called in Nyāya the svarūpa-saṁbandha. The object apprehended determines the knowing process. Cognition is

[1] Cp. Broad: "It does not in the least matter to science what is the *inner nature* of a term, provided it will do the work that is required of it. If we can give a definition of points which will make them fulfil a certain pair of conditions, it will not matter though points themselves should turn out to be entities of a very different kind from what we had supposed them to be" (*Scientific Thought*, p. 39)

[2] *Nyāyabindu*, p. 103; and *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, p. 6.

consciousness of an object.[1] Madhusūdana Sarasvatī [2] quotes from Udayana that "Cognitions by themselves formless are specified only by their objects. That is to say, the objects are the only specifications of cognitions." All cognitions are qualified or characterised by certain things as "This is an inkstand." "That is a tablecloth." If the object known is entirely outside the process, then the correspondence notion of truth will have to be adopted; but its svarūpa is said to be within the process, though the object-in-itself is not identical with the knowledge of it. According to this view, knowledge does not produce objects; nor does it correspond to them, but it apprehends them. It is therefore wrong to hold that the object lies outside the boundaries of knowledge, and what can be known of it is either its effect or its copy in the consciousness of the subject. Whether we perceive, conceive or remember an outer object or an inner state, what we perceive, conceive or remember is the object itself, which is independent of the knowledge process. The Nyāya theory of our immediate and direct awareness of reality is inconsistent with its other assumption, that subject and object are substances which are isolated from one another. Nothing stands between the cognising subject and the cognised object. The two, subject and object, are inseparably connected. One cannot be reduced to the other. The Nyāya is right in repudiating subjectivism, that the objects are the creations of the subject's fancy. The object is not brought into being by the subject's knowing process. Even universal relations are said to be given to and not created by the subject. Sense-data do not appear as disconnected particles, but as possessed of certain properties and qualities. Only, according to later Nyāya, the universal or the basis of identity is known through non-sensuous (alaukika) mental functioning. A large part of the experiences that enter into our knowledge is non-sensuous in character. The constraining power of reality is admitted by the Naiyāyika. The necessity of our experience is not imposed by the subject, but is due to the necessity of the world. The real is not intrinsically divided into the two, selves and the world. The prerequisite of all thinking is the undivided

[1] N.B., iv. 2. 29. [2] *Advaitasiddhi*, i. 20.

reality from which subject and object are derived by a process of abstraction. It is true that abstractions play a large part in our lives, but yet reality in itself, on which our theory of knowledge should take its stand, the primary ontological fact, is consciousness (caitanya). A metaphysical investigation of the nature and conditions of knowledge reveals to us the universality of consciousness. It is the basis and creator of all things, and it is risky to represent consciousness in a semi-materialised image. It is not a compound, though our world may be concrete enough. Our analysis into selves and objects is relative to our practical needs; but this complex cosmos is based on a reality which is intrinsically undivided. The real when thought out assumes this aspect. It is not possible for us to give an intellectual account of reality apart from intellectual discrimination; yet our ideas deal with a reality to which no one of our distinctions is essential. The only absolute, then, is the undivided reality of consciousness, which the Naiyāyika ignores in favour of a plurality of souls and material objects.

While reality is caitanya, or consciousness, truth, which logicians aim at, is something different, since logic assumes the distinction between subject and object, and its impulse can be satisfied only if the world of selves and objects is organised into a coherent whole. The Nyāya, in spite of its allegiance to the correspondence notion, grasps the more adequate character of the coherence theory. It regards all forms of knowledge as parts of one whole, each having its function through its place in the whole, and having no justification beyond what it can claim as part of that whole. The validity of any pramāṇa is established through other pramāṇas.[1] The different kinds of knowledge are interrelated. All knowledge has mediate necessity. When the Naiyāyika warns us against the feeling of satisfaction which dreamers and lunatics

[1] We perceive an object, and the validity of this perceptioni s established through inference and perception of the validity of the factors involved in it—sense-organs, objects, contact between the two, and the resulting act of cognition. The sense-organ is established by inference as the recipient of one class of external stimuli; objects are established by sense-perception; contact is inferred from the non-perception of distinctions; and the resulting act of cognition is perceived by the self through its contact with manas and intimate relation with the cognition (N B, ii. 1. 19).

have, and asks us to take into account the feeling of a normal healthy-minded individual, he is surrendering his theory of correspondence. The normal individual is not he who has the support of the majority. Some illusions may be normal in this sense, but they are not therefore true. The social factor simply distinguishes purely imaginary experiences from those which have more objectivity about them. By comparing our observations with those of others, we can get a working certainty, sufficient for all ordinary purposes. What others perceive no less than ourselves, what is perceived by us identically at different places and times, may be looked upon as true and real. The demands of science require us to check our ordinary perceptions. Though we perceive the movement of the sun across the sky, science tells us that the earth revolves round the sun. More elementary and disconnected experiences are to be interpreted in the light of more unified and systematised experiences. The standard is set by the latter. Truth depends not so much on the object as on its capacity to fit into the space-time scheme. The structure of reality must be capable of accommodating the truth. It is assumed that the space-time continuity has a systematic nature. The Naiyāyika who adopts the pragmatic test is bound to hold that our views of reality are relative to our purposes. Knowledge of an object is just its meaning for our present needs. In practical life we are not concerned about the essences of objects but only their meaning for us. To say that for all men stones are hard and fires are hot means that these objects have the same meaning for us. Practically justified correspondence is the Naiyāyika's meaning of truth, and ever so many illusions normal to all individuals and the race are true by this criterion. Nor is this test capable of use with regard to events in the past and the future. Though our truths are relative, they are not all of equal value. The highest truth is that which satisfies the vital logical need of understanding the world as a whole. The ideal experience which comprehends the nature of reality as it is, including both the finite subjects and the environment, is the absolute standard of truth. Not in the sense that many men have attained to it, but in the sense that when one attains the logical view, he will realise it as the truth. True normality

cannot be ascertained by a counting of heads.[1] The mere fact that the large majority of men believe in the pluralistic view does not indicate anything else than the practical value of that conception. Truth and untruth are not questions to be decided by a plebiscite. If the majority of men have an attack of jaundice, the nature of truth does not alter. Truth is that which reveals itself to those who have sounded the depths of experience. The Naiyāyika admits the higher validity of ārṣajñāna, or the wisdom of the seers. He asks us to judge our experiences by the achievement of individuals who have better comprehended the nature of reality. Truth, like goodness and beauty, is an achievement of the individual mind, and in another sense it is a revelation to the human mind of a world unrealised as yet but awaiting realisation in and through a fuller experience. We do not so much construct truth as find it. Yet the Naiyāyika again and again slips into the point of view of the psychologist who assumes that souls and matter are conditions which bring about knowledge. The relativity of knowledge to our ends does not confirm the absolute division between subject and object which the Nyāya assumes. It implies faith in the demands of our nature and in the possibility of their satisfaction. That the nature of the real is adapted to the needs of human action, shows the essential interrelatedness of the two aspects of reality, minds and their environment. The manifest pluralism and the unrelatedness of things is only apparent. The conception of a plurality of reals externally related to one another must yield place to the idea of the essential unity of the world.

In accordance with the implications of the instrumental and relative character of all thought, the Naiyāyika should admit the relative nature of the ideal of truth itself. Logical truth, which is reality conceived as a system of interrelated

[1] Cp. " Does the truth of the fact that a blind man has missed the perfect development of what should be normal about his eyesight depend for its proof upon the fact that a larger number of men are not blind ? The very first creature which suddenly groped into the possession of its eyesight had the right to assert that light was a reality. In the human world there may be very few who have their spiritual eyes open, but in spite of the numerical preponderance of those who cannot see, their want of vision must not be cited as an evidence of the negation of light " (Rabindranath Tagore) See Foreword in Radhakrishnan's *Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*.

selves and objects, is relative to the logical interest, though it is very much more satisfactory than the view which regards the universe as a plurality of independent reals. Truth is reality taken as ideal, regarded as an intelligible system. Our judgments and inferences aim at the comprehension of the whole. According to the degree in which they succeed and fail in the endeavours, their place in the body of knowledge is determined. All logical truth is relative in the sense that the individual is a fragment of reality handling another fragment loosened from its context, and it is impossible, so long as one occupies the logical standpoint, to grasp reality in itself. Our thought is forced to distinguish and select, and we are obliged to use the pragmatic test. The widest thought is compelled to leave out the existence of itself, which in reality it must include. All knowledge is an abstraction from the real. It is an ideal reconstruction of the absolute.[1]

The Nyāya analysis of perception and its view of svarūpa-saṁbandha support the doctrine of the presence in knowledge of reality. The distinction of indeterminate and determinate perception suggests the view of the relativity of our knowledge to our interests. In some stages we have but an undiscriminating acquaintance with reality, and in others a closer grasp of its complexity. The acceptance of the pragmatic test of practical utility confirms the view of the relativity of our knowledge to our limited standpoints. While the conception of reality as made up of two unlike spheres may be legitimate and useful for the purposes of psychology, it has to be transcended when we arrive at the logical point of view. As we have shown, the Nyāya is aware that it is only the coherence conception of truth that can be adopted in logic. The natural conclusion from this whole doctrine of relativity is that even this logical ideal of a complex cosmos with interrelated members cannot be regarded as absolute. The Nyāya did not choose to face this ultimate problem. But its theory of knowledge, when consistently carried out, leads clearly to the position

[1] Cp. Bradley: "That the glory of this world in the end is appearance leaves the world more glorious, if we feel it is a show of some fuller splendour; but the sensuous curtain is a deception and a cheat, if it hides some colourless movement of atoms, some spectral woof of impalpable abstractions, or unearthly ballet of bloodless categories" (*Logic*, vol. ii, p. 591).

that the distinctions of subject and object arise within the fact of knowledge or experience, which alone is the absolute or the ultimate fact behind which we cannot go.

XXI

The World of Nature

The Nyāya accepts the metaphysics of the Vaiśeṣika, and regards the world of nature as a composite of eternal, unalterable, causeless atoms, existing independently of our thoughts. The physical conceptions of the Nyāya are almost the same as those of the Vaiśeṣika.

It will, however, be of interest to know the way in which the Nyāya answers the objections of the rival schools. The problem of time offers peculiar difficulties. Some Naiyāyikas hold that time is a form of experience and is perceived by the sense-organs as a qualification of objects of perception. For example, Rāmakṛṣṇādhvarin, the author of *Śikhāmaṇi*, says that since we cognise objects as existing at present, time also may be said to be perceived. In the perception of the jar as existing at present (idānīm ghaṭo vartate), present time also enters into the perception of the object. Every object is perceived as existing in time, though time is never perceived by itself.[1] Temporal relations are dependent on the terms related. There is no sooner or later, before or after, apart from events and actions. Time is perceived as a qualification of objects, and is therefore a substantive reality.[2]

The Mādhyamika theory, that there is no present time (vartamānakāla) apart from the past and the future, is examined by Vātsyāyana.[3] The past is defined as that which precedes the present, and the future as that which succeeds it. But the present has no meaning apart from the past and the future. Vātsyāyana replies that all this is due to a confusion between time and space. The objector argues that when the object falls, we have the time taken up by its traversing a certain distance and the time that will be taken up by it in traversing the remaining distance, and there is no intervening distance which the object can be said to traverse at the present time. Space traversed gives the idea of past time, space to be traversed that of the future, and there is no third space which could give rise to the present time.[4] But, says Vātsyāyana, "time, or kāla, is not manifested by space (adhvā) but by action (kriyā)." "We have the con-

[1] *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 136.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[3] N.B., ii. 1. 39–ii. 1. 43. See I.P., p. 649.
[4] N.B., ii. 1. 39.

ception of time (as past) when the action of falling has ceased. . . . When the same action is going to happen, we have the conception of time as future; and lastly, when the action of the thing is perceived as going on at the time, we have the conception of present time. In the circumstances, if a person were never to perceive the action as 'going on,' at the time, what could he conceive of as having ceased or as going to happen? . . . At both the points of time (past and future) the object is devoid of action; whereas, when we have the idea that the thing is falling down, the object is actually connected with the action; so that what the present time apprehends is the actual existing connection of the object and the action, and thus it is only on the basis of this (existing connection and the time indicated by it) that we could have the conception of the other two points of time; which latter, for this reason, would not be conceivable, if the present time did not exist."[1] Again, perceptions arise in connection with things which are present in time. There cannot be perception, if there is not present time. The present therefore is not a mere mathematical point but a tract of time with a certain duration, "a slab of time with temporal thickness."[2]

Vātsyāyana argues against several theories of the origin and nature of the world.[3] He criticises the idea of momentariness (kṣaṇikavāda) on the ground that we cannot be certain that an entity will be replaced by another after the lapse of a moment, and there must be a connecting link between the origination of an entity and its cessation. We may admit the truth of momentariness where it is perceived but not where it is not perceived, as in stones, etc.[4] From the successive cognitions we have of objects, their continued existence follows. The theory that all is non-being is rejected on the ground, that if everything is non-being, there cannot be any aggregates.[5] Nor can all things be said to be relative to one another. If long and short are interdependent, then neither of them can be established in the absence of the other. If neither of them is self-existent, it will be impossible to establish their interrelation.[6] The doctrine of impermanence (anityatā) is based on the facts of the production and destruction of things. The Naiyāyika argues that there are things like atoms, ākāśa, time and space, and some qualities of these which are neither produced nor destroyed.[7] The

[1] N.B., ii. 1. 40.

[2] Whitehead: *The Principle of Relativity*, p. 7.

[3] N.B., iv. 2. 31–33, and iv. 2. 26–27.

[4] N.B., iii. 2. 11. See also iii. 2. 12–13.

[5] N.B., iv. 1. 37–40. See also iv. 2. 26–27, 31–33.

[6] "If there is no such thing as the character (or individuality) of things, why do we not have the relative notions of length and shortness in regard to two equal atoms or any two objects of equal size? . . . What relativity (apekṣā) means is that when we perceive two things it becomes possible for us to perceive the preponderance of one over the other" (N.B., iv. 1. 40).

[7] N.B., iv. 1. 25–28.

opposite view that all things are permanent is equally defective, since some things we perceive are produced and destroyed. Composite substances are liable to production and destruction.[1] Vātsyāyana considers also the theory of the absolute diversity of things (sarva-pṛthaktvavāda).[2] The Naiyāyika holds that a whole is not a mere aggregate of its parts, but is something over and above the parts to which it stands in the peculiar relation of samavāya (inherence). Vātsyāyana repudiates the Buddhist view [3] that the whole is nothing but the aggregate of parts, and that the relation is a myth.[4]

The world cannot be produced by abhāva, or non-existence. The supporters of the abhāva hypothesis argue that no effect arises until the cause is destroyed. For the sprout to arise, the seed must be destroyed. Vātsyāyana argues against this view that the cause which is said to destroy cannot come into existence after the destruction, and there is no production out of things destroyed. If the destruction, of the seed were the cause of the rise of the sprout, then the latter must appear at the very moment the seed is broken to pieces. As a matter of fact, the sprout appears only when the disruption of the seed is followed by a fresh composite formed out of its particles. So the sprout is due not to abhāva but a rearrangement of seed particles.[5] The view that the world is the result of chance is examined and rejected. The law of causality cannot be denied without stultifying all experience.[6]

XXII

The Individual Self and Its Destiny

According to the Nyāya, the universe has certain elements which are not corporeal. These are our cognitions, desires, aversions, volitions, and the feelings of pleasure and pain.[7] All these modes of consciousness are transitory, and so are not themselves to be identified with substances. They are viewed as qualities of the substance called the soul.

The soul is a real substantive being, having for its qualities desire, aversion, volition, pleasure, pain and cognition. As a

[1] N.B., iv. 1. 29–33.
[2] N.B., iv. 1. 34–36.
[3] See *Avayavanirākaraṇa* of the Buddhist Aśoka, who lived about the close of the ninth century A.D.
[4] Vātsyāyana's explanation of *Saṁkhyaikāntavāda* is not clear. It may possibly refer to some doctrine as Pythagoras's theory of numbers.
[5] N.B., iv. 1. 14–18.
[6] N.B., iv. 1. 22–24.
[7] If pleasure, pain, desire and aversion are regarded as modes of feeling, we have the three modes of consciousness, knowledge, feeling and will.

rule the Naiyāyika proves the existence of the self by means of inference, though scriptural evidence is adduced in confirmation.[1] Uddyotakara holds that the reality of the self is apprehended by means of perception also. According to him the object of the notion of "I" is the soul.[2] The recognition of the different cognitions as mine proves the continued persistence of the soul.[3] "When a man is desirous of knowing or understanding (a certain thing) at first, he reflects as to what this may be and comes to know it "this is so-and-so." This knowing of the thing is by the same agent to whom belongs the previous desire to know and the subsequent reflection; so this knowledge becomes an indication of the presence of the common agent in the shape of the soul."[4] We remember things which we previously cognised.[5] When one perceives an object, is attracted by it, struggles to obtain it, it is one soul that is the basis of these different activities.[6] If our mental life has at each instant a unique qualitative character which constitutes it a moment in the concrete history of an individual subject, it is because it belongs to this self and not to another. Uddyotakara says: "For one who denies a soul, every cognition must be distinct with a distinct object of its own; and no cognition or recollection would ever be possible."[7] As a mere complex of sensational and affectional elements, no state of consciousness can be distinguished as mine or another's. The experience of another is not *my* experience, for my self is different from his self. All our mental states, such as remembrance, recognition, awareness of the relative persistence of the self, volition or

[1] N.S., i. 1. 10.

[2] N.V., iii. 1. 1. The Vaiśeṣika makes the self an object of yogic perception (V.S., ix. 1. 11; *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 196).

[3] N.B. and N.V., i. 1. 10.

[4] N.B., i. 1. 10.

[5] N.B., iii. 1. 14; also iii. 1. 7–11.

[6] Ekakartṛkatvaṁ jñānecchāpravṛttīnāṁ samānāśrayatvam (N.B., iii. 2. 34).

[7] N.V., i. 1. 10. Vācaspati observes: "If in the absence of the soul the recollection and fusion of cognitions were possible under the hypothesis of every cognition setting up and forming a factor in a series of cognitions, then every cognition would recall and fuse with every other cognition of the same series." This statement of Vācaspati is a paraphrase of Vātsyāyana's remark that "the recognition of one cognition by another cognition would be as possible as the recognition by one body of the experiences of another body" (N.B., i. 1. 10).

the assertion of self, sympathy or consciousness of relation to other selves, all these imply the reality of a self.

The materialist view that consciousness is a property of the body is easily refuted. If it were a property of the body, it would exist in the various parts of the body and its material constituents.[1] If the latter were also conscious, then we have to regard the individual consciousness as the combination of several consciousnesses produced by the different constituents. If body has consciousness, then all matter must have it, since it is of the same nature as the body. If beyond the body there is no soul, then the moral law would seem to be without any significance.[2] Since the body is changing from moment to moment, no sin can pursue us in subsequent lives. If consciousness is the essential property of the body, then it can never lose its essence, and it should be impossible for us to find bodies devoid of consciousness, as we do in corpses. Consciousness is not found in states of trance. It is not a natural quality of the body, since it does not last as long as the body lasts, as colour and the like do.[3] If it were an accidental property of the body, then its cause is something else than the body itself. Again, consciousness cannot be the property of that of which one is conscious but of that which is conscious. If consciousness is a property of the body, then it must be capable of being perceived by others also.[4] Body is not even an auxiliary of consciousness in view of certain familiar experiences. At best it is an instrument or aid for the expression of consciousness. Body is defined as "the vehicle of actions, sense-organs and objects."[5] The soul exerts itself to gain or get rid of objects by means of the body, which is the seat of the senses, mind and sentiments. We cannot identify the body with either consciousness or the self which possesses it. Nor can we identify consciousness with the vital processes. Vitality is a name for a particular relation of the self to the body.[6]

The self is not the senses but what controls them, and

[1] See *Sāṁkhya Sūtra*, iii. 20–21, and Vijñānabhikṣu and Aniruddha on them.

[2] N.B., iii. 1. 4.

[3] N.B., iii. 2. 47.

[4] See I.P., vol. i, pp. 284–285. See also N.B., iii. 2. 53–55.

[5] N.S., i. 1. 11.

[6] *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 263

synthesises their contributions.[1] It is the soul that confers unity on the various kinds of apprehensions. The eye cannot hear sounds nor the ear see visions, and the consciousness that I who am seeing a thing now have also heard of it will not be possible if the soul were not different from and beyond the senses. As instruments, the senses imply an agent which uses them. Being only products of matter, they cannot have consciousness as their property. Even when the object seen and the eye are both destroyed, the knowledge that I have seen remains, and so this knowledge is not a quality of either the outer objects or the senses.[2] Nor is the soul to be identified with manas, which is only the instrument by the aid of which the soul thinks. Since the manas is atomic in nature, it can no more be the self than the body can. If intelligence is a quality of manas, then the simultaneous cognition of things such as yogis have would be inexplicable.[3] The self cannot be identified with the body, senses or manas, since it is present even when the body is lost, the senses are cut off and manas is quieted down.[4] All these belong to the object side, and can never be the subject while self is the subject.[5]

This permanent self is not buddhi or intellection, upalabdhi or apprehension, or jñāna or knowledge.[6] Buddhi is non-permanent, while the soul must be permanent.[7] Our consciousness is to be compared to a flowing stream, where one mental state vanishes as soon as another appears. Whatever be the nature of the object, fleeting like sound or relatively permanent like a jar, cognitions themselves are transitory.[8] The relative permanence of the object accounts for the relative distinctness of the cognition, but cannot make the cognition itself permanent.[9] The capacity for recognition cannot be attributed to buddhi.[10] Intellect (buddhi) according to the Naiyāyika is not a substance nor the cogniser, but a quality of the soul which is capable of being perceived. The self is the perceiver of all that brings about pain and pleasure

[1] N.B., iii. 1. 1. [2] N.B., iii. 2. 18. [3] N.B., iii. 2. 19.
[4] P.P., p. 69. See also *Bhāṣāpariccheda*, 47–49.
[5] N.V., iii. 2. 19. [6] N.S., i. 1–5. [7] N.V.T.T., i. 1. 10.
[8] N.B., iii. 2. 1–2; iii. 2. 18–41.
[9] N.B., iii. 2. 44. See also N.V., iii. 2. 45. [10] N.B., iii. 2. 3.

(sarvasya draṣṭā), the experiencer of all pains and pleasures (bhoktā) and the knower of all things (sarvānubhāvī).

The substance to which these qualities belong cannot be made up of parts, for it is an assumption of the Nyāya that compound substances are destructible while simple ones are eternal. Whatever has an origin is necessarily made up of parts, and when the parts fall asunder, the thing perishes. The soul is partless (niravayava) and eternal. It has no beginning and no end. If a soul once began to be, it will sometime cease to be. The soul cannot be of a limited size, since what is limited has parts and is destructible. The soul must be either atomic or infinite, and of no medium size (madhyamaparimāṇa) like compound substances. It cannot be atomic, since we cannot then perceive its qualities of intellection, will, etc. If it were atomic, it would be impossible to account for the cognition which extends all over the body.[1] If of intermediate size, it must be either larger or smaller than the body. Either way, it cannot occupy the body as it does and should do. If it is of the same size as the body, it will be too small for the body, as it grows from birth onwards. Nor can the difficulty of its changing dimension from birth to birth be avoided. So it is all-pervading, though it cannot cognise many things simultaneously, on account of the atomic nature of manas. It is manas that retains the impressions of acts done in the body, and each soul has normally only one manas which is regarded as eternal.[2]

The soul is unique in each individual.[3] There are an infinite number of souls; if not, then everybody would be conscious of the feelings and thoughts of everybody else.[4] If one soul were present in all bodies, then when one experiences pleasure or pain, all should possess the same experiences, which is not the case.

Consciousness is not an essential property of the soul. The series of cognitions can have an end. "As regards the final cognition, it is destroyed either when there are no causes for its continuance (in the form of merit or demerit) or by

[1] *Tarkasaṃgrahadīpikā*, 17.

[2] N.B., i. 1. 16; iii. 2. 56.

[3] N.V.T.T., i. 1. 10; N.B., iii. 1. 14.

[4] The possibility of one soul guiding different bodies is admitted as a supernormal phenomenon (N.B., iii. 2. 32).

reason of the peculiarities of time (which can put an end to the operation of merit and demerit), or by the appearance of impressions produced by the final cognition itself." [1] It follows that the soul which is the substratum of consciousness need not always be conscious. As a matter of fact, it is an unconscious (jaḍa) principle capable of being qualified by states of consciousness.[2] Consciousness cannot exist apart from self, even as the brilliance of the flame cannot live apart from the flame ; but the soul itself is not necessarily conscious. Consciousness is regarded as a quality of the soul produced in the waking state by the conjunction of the soul with manas. It is an intermittent quality of the self.[3]

The soul is an eternal entity which is from time to time connected with a body suitable to its desert. The body has its source in the acts done by the person, and is the basis of pleasure and pain.[4] The body is formed under the influence of the unseen force of destiny,[5] and is the result of the persistence of the effect of the previous acts.[6] Each man becomes endowed with a body fit for being the medium of the experiences which he has to undergo. The birth of a being is not a mere physiological process. Uddyotakara says : "The karma of the parents who have to enjoy the experiences resulting from the birth of the child, as well as the karma of the personality which has to undergo experiences in the world, both these conjointly bring about the birth of the body in the mother's womb." [7] The connection of the soul with the body is called its birth and its separation from it death.[8] At the

[1] N.V., iii. 2. 24.

[2] Udayana views it as a substance possessing knowledge, joy and other pure qualities, eternal, imperishable, unchangeable, not bigger than an atom in size though capable of pervading the body.

[3] N.B. and N.V. on i. 1. 10, and P.P., p. 99.

[4] N.B., iii. 1. 27. The body is composed mainly of earth, though the other elements help in its formation (iii. 1. 27–29). While the human body is mainly made of earth, the Nyāya admits aqueous bodies formed in the regions of Varuṇa, fiery in those of Sun, and aerial in those of Vāyu. There are not, however, ākāśic, or ethereal bodies

[5] N.B., iii. 2. 60–72.

[6] Pūrvakṛtaphalānubandhāt (N.B., iii. 2. 60).

[7] N.V., iii. 2. 63.

[8] iv. 1. 10. The question is asked whether birth and death, *i.e.* rotation in the wheel of saṁsāra, belong to the soul or the manas. Uddyotakara answers : "If by saṁsāra you mean the action (of entering and moving

beginning of creation, an activity is set up in the atoms by which they combine so as to form material objects. A similar activity arises in the minds of the souls, which brings about several other qualities consequent upon the past careers of the souls themselves. The concrete history of each soul embraces a number of lives. At any one moment its historically continuous existence is rooted in the past and embraces an outline of the future. Any one life is but a part of a historically conditioned series.

No serious attempt is made to prove the pre-existence theory, since it is generally accepted. Infants show signs of pleasure and pain in quite early stages ; and we cannot reduce the smiles and cries of the baby to mere mechanical movements like the opening and the closing of the lotus flowers.[1] The human being is very much more than a mere flower. The newborn babe's desire for milk cannot be explained on the analogy of the attraction of the iron by the magnet, since the child is not a mere piece of metal.[2] The objection that children with desires may be produced, even as substances with qualities are produced, is not valid, since desires are not mere qualities but take their rise from previous experience.[3] We come into the world "not in entire forgetfulness, and not in utter nakedness," but with certain memories and habits acquired in the previous state of existence.[4] The argument for pre-existence as well as future life is strengthened by ethical considerations. If we do not assume a past and a future for our souls, then our ethical sense will be violated by loss of merited action (kṛtahāni) and gain of unmerited result (akṛtābhyāgama). There must be a future where we can experience the fruits of our deeds and a past to account for the differences in our lots in the present. When our desert is completely exhausted, our soul is freed from saṁsāra and

off from the bodies), then it belongs to the manas, as it is the manas that actually moves (saṁsarati) ; on the other hand, if by saṁsāra you mean experiencing (of pleasure and pain), then it belongs to the soul, since it is the soul that experiences pleasure and pain" (N.V., i. 1. 19).

[1] iii. 1. 19–21. [2] iii. 1. 22–24. [3] iii. 1. 25–26.

[4] It may well be said that desires and inclinations prove only the existence of the soul and not its previous existence. After all, the Nyāya theory of new beginnings does not require us to accept a past for our souls.

rebirth and attains release or emancipation (mokṣa).[1] According to Vātsyāyana, "the fruition of all one's acts comes about in the last birth preceding release." [2]

Release is freedom from pain.[3] "This condition of immortality, free from fear, imperishable, consisting in the attainment of bliss, is called Brahma." [4] Mokṣa is supreme felicity marked by perfect tranquillity and freedom from defilement. It is not the destruction of self, but only of bondage. It is defined negatively as the cessation of pain, and not as the enjoyment of positive pleasure. For pleasure is always tainted with pain. It is caused as much as pain. Uddyotakara urges that if the released soul is to have everlasting pleasure, it must also have an everlasting body, since experiencing is not possible without the bodily mechanism.[5]

When the scriptural texts speak of the essence of the soul as pleasure, they mean only perfect freedom from pain. The Naiyāyika proves that every idea of liberation includes this minimum of freedom from pain.[6] Freedom is, in the Nyāya, complete cessation of effort, activity, consciousness and absolute cessation of the soul from body, manas, etc. This state of pure existence to which the liberated souls attain is compared to the state of deep dreamless sleep.[7] This state of abstract existence, without knowledge and joy, is, however, said to be one of great glory, as the soul possesses the general qualities of vibhutva, or ubiquity, though not the specific ones (viśeṣaguṇa) of knowledge, desire and will. Vātsyāyana criticises the theory that freedom consists in the manifestation of the soul's happiness on the ground that there is neither evidence nor justification for it. If there is a cause for the manifestation of happiness, it must be either eternal or non-eternal. If the former, then there would be no difference between the soul released and the soul bound. If the cause be non-eternal, what can it be? Not the contact of soul with manas, which by itself brings about nothing. Other aids like merit have to be admitted. But the product of non-eternal merit cannot be eternal. When the merit is exhausted, its product of pleasure must also cease.[8] It is a state absolutely free even from cognitions, which are, according to the Nyāya, evanescent and productive of activity and so bondage. The

[1] N.B., iii. 2. 67. [2] N.B., iv. 1. 64. [3] i. 1. 9.

[4] Tad abhayam, ajaram, amṛtyupadam, brahmakṣemaprāptiḥ (N.B., i. 1. 22).

[5] N.V., i. 1. 22. See also N.B., iv. 1. 58. Pleasure is a quality and not a constituent of the soul, according to Vācaspati. See N.V.T.T., i. 1. 22.

[6] S.D.S., xi.

[7] Suṣuptasya svapnādarśane kleśābhāvavad apavargaḥ (iv. 1. 63).

[8] N.B., i. 1. 22. See also *Nyāyakandalī*, pp. 286–287.

Sāṁkhya view, that freedom is a state of pure consciousness, is criticised on the ground that there must be some cause for the emergence of this consciousness; and whatever is caused is non-eternal. Besides, the Sāṁkhya view that the puruṣa is discriminated from prakṛti in mokṣa, so that the latter ceases to function and the former rests in its own nature, credits the unintelligent principle of prakṛti with too much wisdom.[1]

The critic feels that the mokṣa of the Naiyāyikas is a word without meaning. There is not very much to distinguish the Nyāya philosophy from materialism. It regards the individual as neither the soul nor the body, but the result of their union. When there is a separation between soul and body, "nothing whatever can happen to excite sensation," as Lucretius says, "not if earth shall be mingled with sea and sea with heaven." The peace of extinguished consciousness may be the peace of death. The sleep without dreams is a state of torpor, and we may as well say that a stone is enjoying supreme felicity in a sound sleep without any disturbing dreams. The state of painless, passionless existence, which the Nyāya idealises, seems to be a mere parody of what man dreams to be. To lose sensations, passions, interests, to be free from the conditions of space and time, is certainly different from being born anew in God. Men of a feeling heart shun such a monster as cast of brass, which may find a fit dwelling in a sanctuary filled with the statues of gods. The Vedāntin, to whatever school he belongs, argues that freedom consists in quitting this frail, perishable individuality to be taken up into the being of the infinite. Naiyāyikas are anxious to make out that the condition of freedom is one of bliss,[2] but they cannot do so until they revise their conception of the soul's relation to consciousness.

XXIII

Some Critical Considerations on the Nyāya Theory of the Soul and Its Relation to Consciousness

The Naiyāyika is not clear about the status of consciousness in his theory. He regards the soul by itself as unconscious, and argues that consciousness is produced by the reaction of

[1] N.S., iii. 2. 73–78. [2] *Nyāyasāra*, pp. 39–41. Cp. also N.B., i. 1. 22.

the self to organic nature. He assumes the reality of a soul substance to account for the unity of our consciousness. Our consciousness is not the same for two moments, and there are periods when it often lapses altogether. Yet there seems to be an identity which makes us remember things and say that we are the same in childhood and old age. To explain this phenomenon, the Naiyāyika assumes an eternal self-substance, which remains the same, though conscious states supervene one upon another. But can the soul be unconscious and yet be able to recognise? If in sleep and such other states there is a complete breach of our conscious life, and if the soul were an unconscious substance, how can the phenomenon of recognition be accounted for? If the self assumed by the Naiyāyika were not an eternal consciousness witnessing the series of mental states, it cannot recognise or remember. As Śaṁkara says: " Even for him who maintains that consciousness fails in those states, it is not possible to speak of a failure not witnessed by consciousness." [1] The self must be an uninterrupted consciousness which never takes a holiday. The Naiyāyika is right in holding that, if consciousness means a succession of states of consciousness of something observed either by itself or from outside, then it is not the fundamental reality, the subject which is eternal and self-sufficient. But this latter principle need not be beyond consciousness. An unconscious soul registering the traces left by conscious states, is on the same level with the brain retaining the impressions of conscious occurrences. If the self is not to be viewed as a constant consciousness, then we need not assume it at all. The brain cells of the organism may serve as the basis of memory and recognition. But the Naiyāyika is not satisfied with such a solution, and therefore he has to admit a conscious subject or self. This seems to be the implication of his view of the self as an immaterial substance. It is said to be spiritual, and it is necessary to admit that it is conscious, though not in the empirical sense. The Naiyāyika is anxious that the eternal self should not be identified with fleeting cognitions. The spiritual reality of the self is not to be confused with the transitory mental states. The self is not always qualified by these passing mental phenomena. But if it is to serve the

[1] S.B., ii. 3. 18.

purpose for which it is assumed, then it must be of the nature of consciousness. The Sāṁkhya view is, on this point, a step in advance of the Nyāya.

Unless we assume the reality of self as consciousness, the explanation of consciousness becomes difficult. We cannot make consciousness a *tertium quid*, a sort of mechanical glow which arises when two unconscious substances, soul and matter, interact. If the soul by itself is not conscious, and if consciousness is induced in it by the action of the outer world on it, there is nothing to distinguish the Nyāya theory from materialism, say as it may that consciousness is not a mere by-product of the brain. Consciousness is furthest removed from materiality, and we cannot find any mechanical equivalent to it. It is inconceivable how material and non-material entities interact. When we pass from a material event to a psychical state, we step from one world into another incommensurable one. It is no explanation to say that conscious states are epiphenomena produced by the interaction of two unconscious substances, soul and manas. The soul is infinite and partless (niravayava), the manas is atomic and partless, and how can we conceive the interaction between the two? [1] If consciousness is something originated in the infinitely extended self, is the substrate of this consciousness the self in its whole extent, or a part particularised by the body? The former is not admissible, since then all things should present themselves to consciousness all at once. The latter is not admissible, since the self has no parts. It is no use taking shelter under the determining character of merit and demerit, for these can have little to do with the apprehension of the sea or the sky or the rivers or the mountains. Śaṁkara urges several objections. Since every soul is omnipresent, the manas connected with one soul must be connected with all souls, with the result that all souls should have the same experiences. Since all souls are all-pervading, they must be in all bodies as well. Many all-pervading souls must be regarded as occupying the same space.[2] If consciousness

[1] S.B., ii. 2. 17. In the state of pralaya, or destruction, the souls are not supposed to be in contact with atoms. How do they retain the traces of their past? Does the manas retain them, and is the manas with the soul in the pralaya as well

[2] S.B., ii. 3. 50–53.

is traced to the action of the self on manas, which is material in nature, then the soul must be looked upon as sharing the character of consciousness, for two material bodies, when they come into contact with each other, can only produce a material phenomenon. If we wish to escape from the charge of materialism, which makes intelligence the unpurposed effect of a blind dance of atoms or electrons, we have to assume the independence of consciousness. The soul must be regarded as a spirit unceasingly active, though we may not be aware of its activity. Forgetfulness and falsehood require explanation, and not memory and knowledge.

If we distinguish soul and body, we have to rely upon the conception of adṛṣṭa or Descartes's *deus ex machina* to account for their interaction. According to the Nyāya, the soul as vibhu or all-pervading, is always in contact with manas, and cognitions arise when manas comes into contact with sense-organs. Manas is on the one side, joined to the sense-organs, and, on the other, to the soul. How it is able to do this is a mystery which the Naiyāyika solves by appealing to the power of God.

The Nyāya regards soul and body as not only distinct but as co-ordinately real. It adopts the theory of a separable soul inhabiting a body which is to be defined in terms of matter. In the human organism, soul and body cannot be regarded as of equal rank. Nor are they exclusive. The soul is not something added from outside to the machine of the body. The Naiyāyika believes in a more organic connection between the spiritual and the physical aspects of human nature.[1] According to the theory advocated by the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika, matter is the vehicle and instrument for the expression of ideal purposes. There is more of meaning and value in spirit than in matter, and therefore more of reality. The distinction between soul and body has to be viewed as one of higher and lower levels of experience.

The Naiyāyika is aware that consciousness is the basis and *prius* of all experience. It is not a fact among facts, like the sun or the earth, but the necessary ground of reference of all facts. Buddhi, instead of being a mere quality induced in the self by the action of the outer objects, is the necessary basis of all experience. Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa defines it as the

[1] N.B., iii. 2. 60.

"condition of all experience" (sarvavyavahārahetuḥ).[1] Śivāditya defines buddhi as "the illuminating principle belonging to the soul,"[2] which the commentator Jinavardhana explains more clearly as "of the nature of light, since it dispels the darkness of ignorance and illuminates all objects."[3] What is prior to all experience cannot be derived from experience. While the particular ideas and beliefs may be consequent upon environmental conditions, the latter by themselves cannot account for them apart from the basis of consciousness. Buddhi as defined by the Nyāya belongs to the subject side.[4] It is not a temporary phase, but the essential nature of the subject which can never become the object, the universal consciousness, apart from which neither finite individuals nor objects are possible.

If consciousness is the basis of all experience, the foundational reality within which the finite selves and the objects of which they are conscious fall, it is more than finite. The individual subject and the object are fragmentary phases of the infinite, which are ever changing. The self which the Nyāya assumes to account for the synthesis of the manifold experiences of life, is of the nature of consciousness which makes possible all experience. We cannot call it a substance, since that would be to apply to it conceptions valid only in the world of experience, seeing that it is in virtue of the presence of this constant consciousness that a world of experience is possible. If we include within this experience that which is superior to it and at the same time constitutes it, the self becomes a thinking *substance* with other things outside it.

A distinction will have to be made between the self as pure consciousness, common to all individuals, and the finite selves which have a historical existence. The self of the Naiyāyika is something which grows, is plastic and has a

[1] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 43. Govardhana, in his *Nyāyabodhinī*, regards vyavahāra as equivalent to śabdaprayoga, or whatever can be expressed through words, though this view is too narrow.

[2] Ātmāśrayaḥ prakāśaḥ. *Saptapadārthī*, 93. Cp. Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa's definition of Ātman as jñānādhikaraṇam (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, 17).

[3] Ajñānāndhakāra - tiraskārakāraka - sakalapadārthasyārthaprakāśakaḥ pradīpa iva dedīpyamāno yaḥ prakāśaḥ sā buddhiḥ.

[4] N.V., iii. 2. 19.

history. The arguments that what has a beginning will have an end, what is put together is liable to dissolution and decay, and that the simple can in no manner be dissolved or destroyed, prove the eternal character of the pure self, and not that of the historical souls. The latter have ends and ideals which determine their reactions to the conditions of life. The susceptibility of the finite individual to particular emotions and the obstacles which impede its activity are due to historical circumstances. The kind of permanence which the growing individuals possess is not to be confused with the constancy of the pure self. The relatively fixed character of the nature of the finite selves is derived from external factors. The self-enclosed historical selves are infinite in number. A sure philosophic instinct guides the Naiyāyika when he regards the limits of individual and physical particularity as accidents of the self, which it will be freed from when it is delivered from the curse of mortality. The defining character of the self must persist, whether it is in a state of freedom or bondage. Since the nature of the self transcends our knowledge, we feel that what remains after eliminating the intellectual, emotional and volitional impulses, is a mere blank. The Naiyāyika is, however, convinced that the basis of the accidental properties is something real. It is the relation to the object that hides the truth of the self. The self in us is clouded by the passive element of matter. The Naiyāyika is right in his view that the spirit is immortal, though he is wrong in confusing it with the jīvātman, which has no recollection of the former life, any more than of the uninterrupted presence of consciousness. While the ātman in us is the universal spirit, the identical self, yet the faculty which receives impressions is, because of its receptivity, something dependent, passive, perishable, partaking more of the nature of matter. The ātman or the self in us which is regarded as immaterial cannot admit of any suspension of its activity. It is not subject to enfeeblement or corruption, while the manas, like the body which houses it and the associated organs, is of a different character. The facts experienced by each soul are different, since the souls are attached to different organs of thought. If the soul is freed from its association with manas, then all objects would reach consciousness simultaneously, and the contents of all

souls which are omnipresent would be the same. This universal content is grasped by each finite soul from one peculiar point of view determined by the spatio-temporal order in which each soul is placed. The view which Viśvanātha assigns to the Vedāntin, that the self is knowledge, while all objects are but special forms of it determined by historical circumstances, is unavoidable.[1]

That the exclusiveness of the jīvātman is not its essential property comes out from the fact of knowledge itself. If each soul is a distinct spiritual unit with a peculiar manas, we cannot be sure that the worlds which they perceive are all one. If each unit makes a world for itself, a radical pluralism, where there are as many worlds as there are units, would result. The Nyāya is anxious to escape from subjectivism, and believes that we all know a common world. In other words, we are able to transcend the limits of the here and the now, rise above the contingent, the particular and the fragmentary, to the necessary, the universal and the infinite. All knowledge has an element of the necessary, something that must be. The knowing self cannot be finite. The relation of the finite subject to the world is not static. The finite consciousness is never complete, and is therefore ever at unrest with itself. The characteristic of finite thought is to be continuously self-transforming. Human thinking is dialectical in its procedure, always attempting to negate the relatively static character of what is external to it. All that seems external to consciousness is not really so. That we are discontented with what we are, is a claim to what we ought to be. To try to get beyond the merely empirical order of things and events is to aim at a more fundamental reality, which is nothing else than the supreme consciousness which regards nothing as alien to itself. The Naiyāyika distinguishes the pure self from the historical individuality dependent on the ideals and beliefs which give, so to say, a sort of concretion

[1] Nan vastu vijñānam eva ātmā tasya svataḥ prakāśarūpatvāc cetanatvam Jñānasukhādikaṁ tu tasyaivākāraviśeṣaḥ. Tasyāpi bhāvatvād eva kṣaṇikatvam pūrvapūrvavijñānasyottaravijñāne hetutvāt (*Siddhāntamuktāvali*, 49). The self is knowledge indeed. Its character as knowledge is proved by its self-manifestation. Knowledge of this or that object, happiness, etc., are special forms of it. Being simply objects, they are transitory, the preceding mental states causing the succeeding ones.

to the pure self. If we are able to distinguish at any moment the nature of the finite self, it is through its organic character and ideals, determined by its past history and environmental conditions. But these individualising conditions of the ideals, the organism and the environment, are admitted by the Naiyāyika to be different from the true self, though resting on it. The Naiyāyika has logically to admit that the doctrine of the plurality of selves is based on the accidental properties of the self, and it will have to be given up when the essential nature of the self is emphasised. The historical point of view which is not ultimate yields a pluralistic conception of the universe; the metaphysical point of view which is ultimate transcends pluralism. The Nyāya argument, that the supreme self cannot be one, since on that view there will be a confusion of the different experiences of pleasure—pain, cannot be pressed, since the distinction of historical selves is not denied. The many minds determine the different souls, which in their turn are said to mould into shape the universe by their deeds. While the individual souls are not in touch with all aspects of the universe, Śrīdhara admits that there must be at least one soul which has the whole universe for its sphere of experience. This soul has not any general relation to all things, but has intimate relation with and control over all.[1] In essence all souls are one. The empirical differences which we notice among the souls are determined by the intimate and special relations into which the souls, which are in general touch with all things, enter.

To assume the fundamental reality of the universal consciousness or self is not to support the doctrine of subjectivism. To base the distinction of subject and object on the reality of the universal self is not to deny that the earth and the planets spun on their axes and waltzed round the sun æons before there was a living plant to respond to the light of the sun or a sentient eye to translate solar energy into light.

The Nyāya cannot account for experience so long as it regards consciousness as a mere property of the soul. Self, as universal consciousness, is to be admitted, if experience is to be rendered intelligible. The Nyāya is right when it says that environmental conditions lead to the development of

[1] *Nyāyakandalī*, p. 88.

certain ideas and beliefs, and the development constitutes the historicity of human nature. This human nature, however, is not the subject of all consciousness, but is a development within consciousness determined through an objective medium. The distinctness of the souls is due to the earthly life in which they partake. The finite beings, though rooted in matter, strive to flower in spirit. The perfected souls live within the spirit's fire when the smoke of their bodies passes away. Nor have we on this view the danger that the freed soul is empty-handed. The distinction of one and many has no meaning, so far as the freed condition of the souls is conceived. It is to some such view that we are led, if we try to carry out the central teaching of the Nyāya philosophy and rid it of its inconsistencies, though the Nyāya thinkers themselves were not clearly aware of it.

XXIV

Ethics

The Nyāya thinkers do not draw a hard and fast line of distinction between will and intellect. Intellect is no more a passive agent receiving or reflecting objects presented to it than will is a mysterious power which comes into operation after the intellect presents objects to it. All knowledge is purposive and even as we cognise objects we like or dislike them, try to obtain or avoid them. When we think an object, we at the same time value it and adopt a definite practical attitude to it. Ethics deals with the practical side of man's life, more especially with voluntary activities.

A psychological analysis of the nature of volition is given in some Nyāya treatises. Viśvanātha [1] mentions a number of conditions of icchā or desire. We do not desire impossible things. Only children cry for the moon. As a rule we desire things which seem to be within our reach.[2] Again, the objects willed are recognised to be desirable, as conductive to the good of the agent.[3] Even when we will to commit suicide, or drive a thorn into our flesh, it is because we believe in the value of these objects. Nothing has value except in relation to a subject, though the subject may look upon suicide and such other courses of conduct as conducive to his welfare, in an abnormal state

[1] *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, 146-150.
[2] Kṛtisādhyatājñāna.
[3] Iṣṭasādhanatājñāna.

of mind.[1] Whatever other judgment may be passed on it later, at the time of the volition the object must be regarded as desirable. In determining the desirability of a plan of action, we take into account all its consequences and make sure that its adoption will not be accompanied by greater evil.[2] When an object threatens to yield more harm, we do not care to pursue it. This condition involves a careful survey of the consequences of the proposed course of action.

Voluntary activities which are instinctive[3] and automatic, where the operation of will (svecchādhīnatva) is absent, are not, strictly speaking, the objects of moral judgment. The soul is not the victim of desires and aversions which flood upon it from outward sources. If the soul were by itself an unconscious entity, then its aversions and the preferences may be regarded as the destiny which drags the soul along in its train. The Nyāya assumes a power of initiative, selection and choice, implying thereby that the nature of the soul is spiritual freedom. Vātsyāyana combats the view which traces all events to the direct intervention of God, providing no room for human effort (puruṣakāra).[4] The human will is efficient enough, though it works under the control of God. Vātsyāyana refutes the notion that the will works without any cause.[5]

All acts have for their motive (prayojana)[6] the desire to obtain pleasure (sukhaprāpti) and avoid pain (duhkhaparihāra). Pain, the cause of uneasiness,[7] is the sign that the soul is not at rest with itself. The highest good is deliverance from pain and not the enjoyment of pleasure, for pleasure is always mixed up with pain.[8] Saṁsāra is of the nature of

[1] Rogadūṣitacittaḥ.

[2] Balavad aniṣṭānanubandhitvajñāna. This is ambiguous, and may mean either the consciousness of the absence of evil (aniṣṭa ajanakatvajñāna) or the absence of the consciousness of any evil (aniṣṭajanakatvajñānābhāva). Viśvanātha inclines to the latter view.

[3] Jīvanayonipūrvaka, 152.

[4] N.B., iv. 1. 19–21.

[5] N.B., iv. 1. 22–24.

[6] N.B. and N.V., i. 1. 24, on it; also N.B., iii. 2. 32–37.

[7] i. 1. 21.

[8] S.D.S., xi. Uddyotakara somewhat modifies the view. "If there were no pleasure, merit would be entirely useless. . . . Nor will it be right to regard the mere negation of pain as the result of merit, since then the result of merit will be a merely negative entity. In ordinary life we find a twofold activity among men. One acts with a view to obtain something

suffering, though it may seem on occasions to be pleasant. To escape from saṁsāra is to attain the highest good. "Pain, birth, activity, faults, false notions: on the successive annihilation of these in turn, there is the annihilation of the one next before it."[1] Pain (duḥkha) is the result of birth (janma), which is the result of activity (pravṛtti). All activity, good or bad, binds us to the chain of saṁsāra and leads to some kind of birth, high or low. The Naiyāyika blushes that he has a body, and declares with Novalis that "life is a disease of the spirit, an activity excited by passion." The activity is due to the defects of aversion (dveṣa), attachment (rāga) and stupidity (moha). Aversion includes anger, envy, malignity, hatred and implacability. Attachment includes lust, avarice, avidity and covetousness. Stupidity includes misapprehension, suspicion, conceit and carelessness. Stupidity is the worst since it breeds aversion and attachment.[2] Through these defects, we forget that there is nothing agreeable or disagreeable to the soul and come to like and dislike objects. The cause of these defects is false knowledge (mithyājñāna) about the nature of the soul, pain, pleasure, etc. To attain the timeless condition of freedom, which is the only real value, we must put an end to the chain which begins with false notions and ends with pain. When false knowledge disappears, faults pass away. With their disappearance, activity has no *raison d'être*, and so there is no chance of birth. Cessation of birth means abolition of pain, which is another name for final bliss.[3]

So long as we act, we are under the sway of attachment and aversion and cannot attain the highest good. The hatred of pain is still hatred and the attachment to pleasure is still

desirable, while another acts with a view to avoid the undesirable; and if there were nothing desirable, this twofold activity would not be possible. Again (if there were no pleasure), there could be no such advice, as that pleasure should be looked upon as pain; lastly, there could be no attachment, since no one is ever attached to pain" (N.V., i. 1. 21). Śrīdhara does not agree with the view that pleasure is the mere absence of pain in view of the positive experience of bliss and the twofold activities of men (*Nyāyakandalī*, p. 260).

[1] N.S., i. 1. 2; iv. 1. 68. Cp. with this the Buddhist chain of causation (*Visuddhimagga*, xix).

[2] iv. 1. 3–9.

[3] N.B., iii. 2. 67; iv. 1. 6; iv. 2. 1.

attachment and, so long as these are operative, the highest good is beyond our reach.

The Naiyāyika asks us to suppress all sense of separateness, for he allows that the activities of one whose defects are overcome do not tend to rebirth.[1] Those who are saved in this life go on performing work as long as they are in body, and this work does not bind them. So long as we cling to individuality and accumulate virtue to become Indra or Brahmā, we are bound to the circuit, for even the states of Indra and Brahmā have an end. The highest good consists in freedom from all sense of separateness.

The realisation of true knowledge does not mean an immediate escape from saṁsāra. The desert which is the basis of the connection between the soul and the body must be completely exhausted, thus destroying every chance of a revival of connection between the two.[2]

While the only good is thus freedom from individuality, all courses of conduct which tend to this are said to be good, and those which lead in the opposite direction bad. Activities are distinguished into those of speech, mind and body, and each of them is divided into good and bad.[3] The essence of moral evil lies in the conscious choice of the evil in preference to the good. Under the influence of strong passion (utkaṭarāga), we misconceive the painful effects of sin and fall a prey to the attractions of pleasure.

The adoption of virtuous activities will enable one to discriminate the soul from the body and the senses. True knowledge, so much insisted on, is not a matter of mere intellectual opinion, but a kind of general attitude. False knowledge and selfish attitude go together.[4] True knowledge and unselfishness are organically related. This true knowledge cannot be acquired from books, but only through meditation

[1] N.S., iv. 1 64. [2] N.S., iv. 1. 19–21.

[3] i. 1. 17. Charity, protection and service are good bodily activities, while murder, theft and adultery are bad. Speaking the true, the useful and the pleasant and study of sacred books are good activities relating to speech, while lying, using harsh language, and slandering and indulging in frivolous talk are bad. Compassion, generosity and devotion are good activities of the mind, while those of malice, covetousness and scepticism are bad.

[4] N.V., iv. 2. 2.

and increase of righteousness.[1] In addition to study and reflection,[2] yoga practices are enjoined.[3] Uddyotakara advises scriptural study, philosophic thought and meditation.[4] We are sometimes asked to refrain from worldly pleasures, renounce all desires, retire to a forest and make our souls the sacrificial fire in which our physical actions are offered as oblations. Bhakti as a means of securing peace and happiness is permitted. Though God does not interfere, the act of devotion brings its own reward.[5]

Like the other systems of Hindu thought, the Nyāya accepts the principle of karma, and believes in the persistence of the results of our activity. Some of our activities produce their results immediately like, say, the act of cooking, while others take a longer time to mature, like the act of ploughing. Acts of piety and ceremonialism are of the latter kind, since attainment of heaven is not possible until after death.[6] In the interval the causes have not disappeared, but persist in the form of dharma and adharma. "Prior to the actual accomplishment of fruition, there would be something (in the shape of an intermediary) just as there is in the case of the fruit of the trees."[7] The adṛṣṭa, or the unseen quality, is not different from karma; for, if so, "even after final release there would be a likelihood of a body being produced."[8] The bodies which the souls assume are determined by their past karma. The body gives the name to the soul, which, though neither man nor horse, is yet called man or horse according

[1] N.B., iv. 2. 38 and 41.

[2] N.B., iv. 2. 47.

[3] N.B., iv 2. 46. The Naiyāyikas are also called yogas. "Naiyāyikānāṁ yogaparābhidhānānām" (Guṇaratna's *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccayavṛtti*) See also his *Tarkarahasyadīpikā*. Vātsyāyana mentions the Nyāya view under yoga in i. 1. 29.

[4] N.V., i. 1. 2.

[5] *Nyāyasāra*, pp. 38, 40–41; and S.S.S.S., vi. 10–21, and 40–44.

[6] Uddyotakara writes: "In cases where the action does not bring about the effect immediately, this is due to the obstruction caused by the peculiar circumstances attending the karmic residuum that is undergoing fruition or the obstruction caused by the fructifying karmic residuum of other living beings whose experiences are akin to those in question, or the acts being obstructed by the acts of those other living beings who may be sharers in the karma of the man in question, or because such auxiliary causes as merit and demerit are not present at the time" (N V., iii. 2. 60).

[7] N.B., iv. 1. 47. See iv. 1. 44–54.

[8] N.B, iii. 2. 68.

to the body with which it is endowed.[1] The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system does not believe in any subtle body. The soul passes from one frame to another through the aid of manas, which is atomic and therefore supersensuous, and is not seen when it leaves the body on death. Since the souls are all-pervading, it is only the manas that can be said to proceed to the new abode of fruition in rebirth.

The real, according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, is a complex of souls and nature. The natural order is not the product of souls, but is the arrangement of a God, who so fashions the atoms as to make the natural order the medium for the souls' experiences. The harmony between souls and nature is due to divine design.

XXV

THEOLOGY

In the *Nyāya Sūtra*, we find only a casual mention of God, which justifies the suspicion that the ancient doctrine of the Nyāya was not theistic.[2] The theory of divine causality is referred to in the *Nyāya Sūtra*.[3] While Vātsyāyana, Uddyotakara and Viśvanātha regard it as the Nyāya view, Vācaspati, Udayana and Vardhamāna interpret is as a criticism of the Vedānta view, that God is the constituent cause of the universe. To the objection that man does not often reap fruits proportionate to his acts, and so everything seems to depend on God's will and not on human effort, the Nyāya says that human acts produce their results under the control and with the co-operation of God. Vātsyāyana supports theism when he declares that the self sees all, feels all and knows all. This description loses all meaning, if it is applied to the imperfect individual self.[4] Later Naiyāyikas as well as Vaiśeṣikas are frankly theistic and enter into a discussion of

[1] N B., iii. 1 26.

[2] "The fundamental textbooks of the two schools, the Vaiśeṣika and the Nyāya Sūtras, originally did not accept the existence of God; it was not till a subsequent period that the two systems changed to theism, although neither ever went so far as to assume a creator of matter" (Garbe: *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 23). Muir "is unable to say if the ancient doctrine of the Nyāya was theistic" (*Original Sanskrit Texts*, vol. iii, p. 133)

[3] iv. 1. 19–21.

[4] N.B., i. 1. 9; iv. 1. 21.

the nature of God in considering the theory of ātman. Annaṁ Bhaṭṭa classifies souls into two kinds, supreme and human. While the supreme is God, one, omniscient, the human souls are infinite in number, different in each body.[1] God is looked upon as a special soul, possessing the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, by which he guides and regulates the universe. Since the human and the divine souls differ in many respects, it is difficult to believe that the original authors, Gautama and Kaṇāda, meant to bring together these two kinds of souls under one comprehensive class. The empirical tendency and the dialectical interests of the Nyāya are responsible for its practical indifference to the question of the reality of God.[2]

Udayana's *Kusumāñjali* is the classic statement of the Nyāya proofs for the existence of God. It sets out, in the first chapter, certain considerations which make for the reality of an unseen cause, adṛṣṭa, or the force which determines our happiness and misery.[3] Every effect depends on a cause, and so there must be a cause for our happiness and misery.[4] Every cause is an effect in relation to its preceding cause, which in its turn is the effect of some other cause. As the world has no beginning, this succession of cause and effect has also no beginning. So the cause of our happiness and misery cannot be traced back to its beginning.[5] Diversity of effects implies diversity of causes. Our varying lots cannot be traced to common causes like God or nature.[6] Our acts

[1] *Tarkasaṁgraha*, 17.

[2] Athalye writes: "Kaṇāda and Gautama might have at first purposely excluded God from their systems, not as being totally non-existent, but as being beyond and above the phenomenal world with which their systems were chiefly concerned. Possibly the aphorists confined themselves to a classification and discussion of sublunary things only, without minding the supernatural agency, while commentators, considering this to be a defect, supplied the omission by inserting God under the only category where it was possible to do so" (*Tarkasaṁgraha*, p. 137). "The Nyāya is so predominantly dialectical in interest that its excursions into metaphysics have an air of divagation from the work in hand, which forbids us to assume that silence on any topic means its exclusion" (Keith: I.L.A., p. 265).

[3] Sāpekṣatvād anāditvād vaicitryād viśvavṛttitaḥ.
Pratyātmaniyamād bhukter asti hetur alaukikaḥ (i. 4).

[4] i. 5.

[5] i. 6. Thus the question about the beginning of adṛṣta is avoided. See N.V., iv. 1. 21.

[6] i. 7.

disappear, leaving behind them traces capable of bringing about the fruits. " A thing long passed cannot produce its result without some continuant influence (karmātiśayam)." [1] The trace of a good action is called merit (puṇya) and that of an evil one demerit (pāpa), and the two together form the adṛṣṭa, or the desert which resides in the soul of the person who performs the acts, and not in the thing from which he derives happiness or misery. This adṛṣṭa causes happiness and misery when the suitable time, place and object occur. The persistence of merit and demerit is accounted for by the transcendent agency of adṛṣṭa. The connection of souls with organic bodies is not due to natural causes. The law of moral causation supervenes on the natural order. The different degrees of enjoyment which different souls receive are determined by the differences in their adṛṣṭa.

Udayana, thus far, is faithful to the ancient Naiyāyikas, who account for the creation of the universe by the hypothesis of an original activity among the atoms and adṛṣṭa among the souls. But he goes beyond them when he argues that a non-intelligent cause like adṛṣṭa cannot produce its effect without the guidance of an intelligent spirit. God is said to supervise the work of adṛṣṭa.[2] The world cannot be explained by the atoms or the force of karma. If atoms are active by nature, then their activity should be unceasing. If their activities are determined by the force of time, then this unconscious principle of time must be either always active or always inactive. The analogy of the flow of milk for the nourishment of the calf will not serve, since milk should flow out of the dead cow also, if it were active by itself. It follows that if an unconscious thing is active, it is so under the influence of a conscious agent. The individual soul cannot be the controller of adṛṣṭa, since then it would be able to avert unwished-for miseries, which it is not. So the unintelligent principle of adṛṣṭa, which governs the fate of beings, acts under the direction of God, who does not create it or alter its inevitable course, but renders possible its operation. God is thus the giver of the fruits of our deeds (karmaphalapradaḥ).

[1] i. 9. [2] i. 19.

The other arguments are summed up by Udayana in the following verse. " From effects, combination, support, etc., from traditional arts, from authoritativeness, from scriptures, from sentences thereof, and from particular numbers, an everlasting omniscient being is established." [1] The causal argument is considered first. The world is looked upon as a product, since it consists of component parts, and so it must have had a maker. For " that is not an effect which can attain its proper nature independently of any series of concurrent causes." The maker of the world is an intelligent being, " possessed of that combination of volition, desire to act, and knowledge of the proper means which sets in motion all other causes, but is itself set in motion by none." Combination (āyojana) is the action which produces the conjunction of two atoms, forming the binary compound at the beginning of creation. This action implies an intelligent agent. Support (dhṛti) signifies that this wonderful universe is supported by his will. The " etc " (ādi) is intended to make out that God is also the destroyer of the world. God makes, unmakes and remakes the world. The traditional arts imply an intelligent inventor. The authoritativeness of the Vedas is derived from a being who imparted that character to them. Udayana holds that the Vedas are non-eternal, like the other things of the world subject to creation and destruction. If they are yet sources of right knowledge, it is because God is their author.[2] Besides, śruti, or the scripture, speaks to us of the author of the world. Again, since the Vedas consist of sentences, they require an author who can only be God. The argument from number is based on the view that the magnitude of the dyad is produced not from the infinite minuteness (parimāṇḍalya) of the atoms, but from the number (two) of the atoms composing the binary. As we shall see, this conception of duality is dependent on understanding (buddhyapekṣā), so that to account for duality which produces the dyads at the beginning of creation, an intelligent being must be postulated. Udayana sets aside the objection against the existence of God based on non-perception. The non-perception of an object proves its non-existence, only if the object is one which is ordinarily open to perception. Things beyond the range of the senses are not non-existent. The utmost that we can say is that the existence of God cannot be established through perception.[3] Inference neither proves nor disproves the existence of God.[4] Comparison has nothing to do with the existence and non-existence of objects.[5] Śabda is in favour of theism.[6] Presumption (arthāpatti) and non-perception (anupalabdhi) are not independent means of knowledge.[7]

The God of the Naiyāyika is a personal being, possessing existence, knowledge and bliss. He is " endowed with such

[1] Kāryāyojanadhṛtyādeḥ padāt pratyayataḥ śrutcḥ
Vākyāt saṁkhyāviśeṣāc ca sādhyo viśvavid avyayaḥ (v. 1).

[2] ii. 1. [3] iii. 1. [4] iii. 4–7.
[5] iii. 8–12. [6] iii. 13–17. [7] iii. 18–23.

regards it as never-failing and as containing all saṁskāras.[1] The memories are stored in buddhi, and not in ahaṁkāra or manas. "Even after the dissolution of ahaṁkāra and manas by means of the knowledge of the truth, there remains recollection."[2]

Apparently, the functions assigned to intellect by the *Kārikā* can be performed by it only if it is posterior to the self-sense or ahaṁkāra, and of the manas and the senses, as well as something knowable as the gross elements; but the Sāṁkhya holds that all these are not present at the first stage when buddhi is present. We have, therefore, to take it in a cosmic sense, as the basis of the distinction between the subject and the object, the perceiving and the perceived; but then we shall have to assume a world-spirit, which the Sāṁkhya does not allow. The status of mahat or buddhi is left in an uncertain condition. Buddhi, as the product of prakṛti and the generator of ahaṁkāra, is different from buddhi which controls the processes of the senses, mind and ahaṁkāra. If the former is identified with the latter, the whole evolution of prakṛti must be regarded as subjective, since the ego and the non-ego are both the products of buddhi. This ambiguity is found in the other products of prakṛti also.

Ahaṁkāra (self-sense), or the principle of individuation, arises after buddhi. Through its action the different spirits become endowed each with a separate mental background. We have here also to distinguish the cosmic and the psychological aspects. Psychologically, the sense of selfhood is impossible without a non-ego or an object. But the development of the objective comes after the rise of ahaṁkāra in the Sāṁkhya theory of evolution. We have to admit the possibility of a cosmic ahaṁkāra out of which individual subjects and objects arise. Ahaṁkāra is conceived as material, and while buddhi is more cognitive in function, ahaṁkāra seems to be more practical. Psychologically, the function of ahaṁkāra is abhimāna or self-love. Agency belongs to it, and not to the self or puruṣa.[3] Mahat stands to ahaṁkāra

[1] S.P.B., ii. 41–42. [2] S.P.B., ii. 42.

[3] S.P.S., vi. 54. Vijñānabhikṣu quotes the Chāndogya passage "bahu syām prajāyeya" (let me multiply myself, let me procreate), and comments: "The creation of the elements and all the rest is preceded by abhimāna, and so it is said to be the cause of creation" (S.P.B., i 63).

as consciousness to self-consciousness. The former is the logical presupposition of the latter. We infer the existence of ahaṁkāra from its effects.[1] It is regarded as a substance, since it is the material cause of other substances. The puruṣa identifies itself with the acts of prakṛti through ahaṁkāra. It passes to the self the sensations and suggestions of action communicated to it through manas. It thus helps in the formation of concepts and decisions. Ahaṁkāra is not what individualises the universal consciousness, since the individuality is already there according to the Sāṁkhya. It individualises the impressions that come from the outer world. When the ahaṁkāra is dominated by the aspect of sattva, we do good work; when by rajas, evil ones; and when by tamas, indifferent ones. In dreamless sleep the function of ahaṁkāra may be absent, but the desires and the tendencies are all there.[2] It is difficult to know how the self-sense is derived from the intellect, or mahat.

The guṇas take three different courses of development from ahaṁkāra according to which the latter is said to be sāttvika, rājasa or tāmasa. From ahaṁkāra in its sattva aspect (vaikārika) are derived the manas and the five organs of perception and the five of action, and from the same in its tāmasa aspect (bhūtādi) the five fine elements. The rājasa aspect (taijasa) plays its part in both and is present in the results.[3] From the tanmātras, or the five fine elements by a preponderance of tamas, the five gross elements arise. In all these developments, though one of the guṇas may be predominant, the others are also present, perform their functions, and help indirectly the evolution of the products.

Manas is the organ which has the important function of synthesising the sense-data into percepts, suggesting alternative courses of action and carrying out the decrees of the

[1] S.P.S., i. 63. [2] S.P.B., i. 63.

[3] S.K., 24–25. Vijñānabhikṣu holds that the sāttvika ahaṁkāra gives rise to manas, the rājasa to the ten organs, and the tāmasa to the five tanmātras (S.P.B., ii. 18). Aniruddha accepts the usual view that rajas is a condition precedent to all evolution, while the other guṇas determine the character of the constituents. While Vācaspati holds that from mahat arises ahaṁkāra and from ahaṁkāra the tanmātras, Vijñānabhikṣu is of opinion that the separation of ahaṁkāra and the evolution of the tanmātras take place in the mahat.

will through the organs of action. As in the case of the intellect and the self-sense, so also in the case of manas no distinction is made between the organ and its function. Manas is said to be the doorkeeper, while the senses are regarded as the doors.[1] The co-operation of manas is necessary for both perception and action.[2] It assumes manifold forms in connection with different senses.[3] Manas is not all-pervading, since it is an instrument possessing movement and action.[4] It is made up of parts, since it is connected with the senses. Buddhi and the other organs are not eternal in the sense that there is an eternal subject or Īśvara possessing them.[5]

The five organs of perception are the functions of sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch. The need creates the function. Since we have the desire, we create the functions and the objects to satisfy them.[6] The senses are not formed of the elements, since the sense and the elements arise out of ahaṁkāra.[7] The senses are not eternal, since their rise and lapse are seen. Each sense grasps one quality. The senses are not the organs of sight, etc., as the functions of manas.[8] They are the means of observing the fine and the gross elements.[9] The organs of action are the functions of the tongue, feet, hands, and the organs of evacuation and reproduction. Manas, with the organs, is said to produce by their action the five vital airs,[10] which are given an independent place in the Vedānta system. According to the Sūtra, prāṇa (life) is a modification of the senses and does not subsist in their absence.[11]

The world as the object of perception has the five tan-

[1] S.K., 35. Buddhi, ahaṁkāra and manas are not always carefully distinguished. They are taken as the inner organ (antaḥkaraṇa). "Antaḥkaraṇa is one and one only according to the threefold distinction of mere states; as in the case of the seed, the sprout, and the huge tree, etc., it falls under the relation of effect and cause." Vijñānabhikṣu quotes a verse from *Vāyu Purāṇa* to the effect: "Mano mahān matir brahmā pūr buddhiḥ khyātir, Īśvaraḥ" (S.P.B., ii. 16). See also S.P.B., ii. 40.

[2] S.P.S., ii. 26.

[3] S.P.S., ii. 27.

[4] S.P.S., v. 69–70.

[5] S.P.S., v. 127.

[6] Cp. M.B. Rūparāgād abhūc cakṣuḥ. From attachment to form the eye was produced. See M.B., Śāntiparva, 213. 16.

[7] S.P.S., ii. 20.

[8] S.P.S., ii. 23.

[9] S.K., 34.

[10] S.P.S., ii. 31.

[11] v. 113.

corresponding to the five sense-organs. These are the essences of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell conceived as physical principles, imperceptible to ordinary beings. Each of them is exclusively concerned with one sense, while the gross elements appeal to more than one sense. These invisible essences are inferred from visible objects, though they are said to be open to the perception of the yogis.[2] The fine elements are said to be devoid of difference (viśeṣa), while the gross elements arising from them have a definite quality.[3] The tanmātras cannot act as sense stimuli until they combine to form atoms. Bhūtādi, or ahaṁkāra, dominated by tamas, is absolutely homogeneous, inert and devoid of all characters except quantum or mass. With the co-operation of rajas it is transformed into subtle matter, vibratory, radiant and instinct with energy, and the tanmātras of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell arise Ākāśa forms the transition link between bhūtādi and the tanmātras. A distinction is made between kāraṇākāśa, non-atomic and all-pervasive, and kāryākāśa, or atomic ākāśa, formed by the combination of bhūtādi, or mass, units with the sound essences. The latter are found held up in the original kāraṇākāśa as the medium for the development of the atoms of air.[4] According to the *Vyāsabhāṣya*, the tanmātra of sound is produced from ahaṁkāra, and from the tanmātra of sound accompanied by ahaṁkāra is produced the tanmātra of touch with the attributes of sound and touch, and so on; the others are produced by the addition of one attribute at each step.

According to Gauḍapāda and Vācaspati, the gross elements arise from the compounding of the fine elements by the process of accumulation. There is, of course, the difficulty that on this view ether, which has but one quality, audibility, cannot be contrasted as a gross element with the corresponding fine element.[5] Vācaspati holds that

---

[1] That only. See *Praśna Upaniṣad*, iv. 8. Cp. the theory of the elements of elements of Empedocles.

[2] *Tattvakaumudī*, 5.

[3] Cp. this with the Chāndogya view (vi. 4) of the production of the gross elements by the intermingling of the three elements, where the former receive their special name from the presence in them of a greater proportion of one element. According to one view of the Vedānta, each element consists of a half of one element and one-eighth of each of the other four.

[4] See Seal: *Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus*.

[5] See Tait. Up., ii. 1.

the ether atom is generated from the other essence, the air atom from the two essences of sound and touch, of which that of touch is the chief, the light atom from the tanmātras of sound, touch and form, of which that of form is the chief, the water atom from the four tanmātras, and the earth atom from the five tanmātras, of which those of taste and smell are the chief ones respectively.[1] Vijñānabhikṣu holds a slightly different opinion. The ether atom is produced from the ether tanmātra through the help of bhūtādi.[2]

When the gross atoms combine, their properties are found in their products, so that they do not give rise to a new kind of existence (tattvāntara).[3] The ākāśa atom possesses penetrability, the air atom impact or mechanical pressure, the light atom radiant heat and light, the water atom has viscous attraction and earth cohesive attraction. By a combination of the gross atoms the element of earth arises. The capacity of the tanmātras to produce the feeling of pleasure or of pain is not perceived while they subsist as tanmātras. Since it is discernible in the state of the gross atoms, the gross elements are distinguished as soothing (śānta), terrific (ghora), and dull (mūḍha). The atoms of earth, etc., by various changes of quality, appear as the manifold variety of cosmic existence. There are not any intrinsic differences between things which are of the same stuff. As the potentiality of everything is in everything,[4] there is always change for the sake of puruṣa. The gross atoms[5] constitute the inorganic as well as the organic bodies, and in the development from the one to the other there is no breach of continuity. Inorganic, vegetable and animal kingdoms are the three stages in the process of development, marked only by changes in the qualities of the constituents[6] and not in the constituents themselves. The

[1] *Tattvavaiśaradī*, i. 44.

[2] *Yogavārttikā*, i. 45. Nāgeśa extends to all atoms this co-operation of bhūtādi. Sarvatra tanmātrais tattatbhūtotpādane 'haṁkārasya sahakāritvam bodhyam.

[3] The evolution of the specific (viśeṣa) from the unspecific (aviśeṣa) is called tattvāntarapariṇāma, as distinct from a mere change of qualities, dharmapariṇāma.

[4] Y.B., iii. 14.

[5] Since they contain tanmātras of different kinds as their constituents, the gross atoms cannot be identified with the Vaiśeṣika atoms. The tanmātras, which have no parts, are invisible compared to the Vaiśeṣika atoms.

[6] Dharmapariṇāma.

appearance of the different qualities is brought about by the different arrangements of the atoms. To the four kinds of bodies usually admitted, the Sāṁkhya adds two, *viz.* those born of will (sāṁkalpikam) and artificial ones (sāṁsiddhikam). Earth is the material cause of all these bodies,[1] though the other elements are present as auxiliary to it. The gross body is composed of the five elements, though there are some who think that ether is not necessary, and others who hold that earth alone will do. It is also said that, while the element of earth predominates in the body of man, that of light predominates in the world of the sun.[2]

Prakṛti and its effects, constituted by the three guṇas, are said to be non-discriminating (aviveki), object (viṣayaḥ), common to many puruṣas (sāmānyam), non-intelligent (acetanam), and productive (prasavadharmi).[3] Each evolute is finer than the one succeeding it and grosser than the one preceding it. The series from prakṛti to the five gross elements numbers twenty-four, and puruṣa is said to be the twenty-fifth principle of the Sāṁkhya system.[4] The twenty-three principles derived from prakṛti are effects, since they are different from prakṛti and puruṣa, are of limited magnitude, and possess the attributes of pradhāna, such as growth and assimilation, and serve as instruments of puruṣa.[5] All the things of the world are said to be the vikṛtis of prakṛti. Prakṛti stands to vikṛtis in the relation of an original substance to its modifications. Mahat, ahaṁkāra, and the five tanmātras are the effects of some and causes of others. The five gross elements and the eleven organs are only effects and not causes of others. While prakṛti is only cause, the

[1] v. 112. [2] iii. 17–19. S.P.B., iii. 19. [3] S.K., 11

[4] 1. Puruṣa.

2. Prakṛti (unmanifested) = manifested.

3. Buddhi, or intellect.	10. Manas.
4. Ahaṁkāra, or self-sense.	11–15. Five senses.
5–9. Five tanmātras of sound, touch, smell, form or colour and taste.	16–20. Five organs of action.
	21–25. Five gross elements of ether, air, light, water and earth.

[5] S.P.S., i. 129–134; S.K., 15.

eleven products are simply effects. Seven of the products are both causes and effects, while the puruṣa is neither cause nor effect.[1]

These products of the evolution, which are capable of originating other products like themselves, are said to be non-specialised (aviśeṣa), while those which cannot originate other existences like themselves are said to be completely specialised (viśeṣa). When ahaṁkāra gives rise to tanmātras, we cannot easily trace the presence of ahaṁkāra in the fine elements. What is derived from ahaṁkāra seems to be a different existence altogether, and this transformation is a case of tattvāntarapariṇāma. The senses and the gross elements cannot give rise to an altogether different kind of existence. So, while ahaṁkāra is non-specialised (aviśeṣa), the senses, etc., are highly specialised (viśeṣa).[2]

Development is only the unfolding of what has already potential existence. The beginning and the end are alike determined. In spite of the things to which prakṛti gives rise, its substance is in no way diminished. The source of becoming is not exhausted by the things produced. No material thing can act without exhausting some of its latent energy. It is thus difficult to regard prakṛti as purely material in nature.

It is difficult to understand the precise significance of the Sāṁkhya account of evolution, and we have not seen any satisfactory explanation as to why the different steps of evolution are what they are.

The different principles of the Sāṁkhya system cannot be logically deduced from prakṛti, and they seem to be set down as its products, thanks to historical accidents. There is no deductive development of the products from the one prakṛti. Vijñānabhikṣu is aware of this defect, and so asks us to accept the Sāṁkhya account of evolution on the authority of the scriptures.[3] But this is to surrender the possibility of philosophical explanation.

[1] S.K., 3. Cp. Erigena: "That which creates and is not created; that which is created and creates, that which is created and creates not; and that which neither creates nor is created" (*De Divisione Naturæ*, Lib. 5). See Garbhopaniṣad, 3.

[2] See Y.B., ii. 19, where the tanmātras and the feeling of personality are said to be aviśeṣa forms of the mahat, while the five elements are the viśeṣa forms of the tanmātras, and the five senses, the five organs of action, and manas are said to be viśeṣa forms of asmitā.

[3] Atra prakṛter mahān mahato 'haṁkāra ityādi sṛṣṭikrame śāstram eva pramāṇam (*Sāṁkhyasāra*). See also Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*, pp. 452–466.

Buddhi, ahaṁkāra, manas and the rest need not be taken as a series of chronologically successive stages of evolution. They are the results of the logical analysis of evolved selves. Vācaspati writes: "Every man uses first his external senses, then he considers (with the manas), then he refers the various objects to his ego (ahaṁkāra), and lastly he decides with his buddhi what to do."[1] While this analysis gives an explanation of the recognition of the different factors on the subject side, it does not help us towards understanding the precise functions of these factors when enlarged to a cosmic plane. The cosmic scheme is framed on the analogy of the human self, since man is a microcosm in which all the factors of reality are repeated, as it were, on a reduced scale. Answering to the alternations of waking, sleeping, we have creation and destruction of the world. In the state of dreamless sleep the self is present, though it does not apprehend the world. So, in the state of world-absorption (pralaya), the selves are not destroyed, though prakṛti is not perceived. When a man wakes up from sound sleep and says, "I slept well, I knew nothing," this nothing is the not-self, or avyakta prakṛti, from which arises the cognition of something. The state of prakṛti, when its activity sinks into rest, corresponds to the state of suṣupti or dreamless sleep of the individual soul. When one wakes up from it, there is first the dawning of consciousness, followed immediately by the rise of the sense of selfhood and the restlessness of desire. The senses and the five elements of sound, touch, etc., come next into activity. It is only when the man wakes up that the gross elements are apprehended by him. Consciousness or buddhi, is the first glow in the vacant sky that arises when the self is confronted by the not-self. The self becomes aware that there is something. It next becomes conscious of its individuality through distinction from the not-self. It has the feeling that "I perceive the object." Then we discover that the object is a series of mental states synthesised by mind and made up of elements.[2] The whole scheme of the Sāṁkhya

[1] *Tattvakaumudī*, 23.

[2] Sir R. G. Bhāndārkar gives a Fichtean interpretation of the Sāṁkhya theory of evolution. The individual who knows directly what passes in his consciousness is aware of certain sensations of which he is not the generator. He therefore assumes an external nature. Its reality is evidenced

evolution seems to be based on the psychological experience of the individual. But the transition from the psychological to the metaphysical was mediated by the historical fact that in the Upaniṣads the self-conscious Brahmā is said to be the first offshoot of the absolute consciousness. The conception of mahat as the first product of prakṛti can be traced to the derivation of the great soul from the unmanifested (avyakta) in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad.*[1] Mahat is prakṛti (non-being) illuminated by consciousness (being). We have in the Upaniṣads the idea of Hiraṇyagarbha or Brahmā, the world soul, who is said to be derived from the impersonal Brahman. The only way in which the conception of the rise of mahat from prakṛti can be made intelligible is through the acceptance of the Vedānta position. There is the supreme Brahman beyond both the subject and the object. The moment it is related to the object it becomes a subject with an object set over against it.[2] While the nature of the supreme is pure consciousness, that of prakṛti is unconsciousness; and when the two intermingle we have consciousness-unconsciousness, or subject-object, and that is mahat. Even non-being is potential being or potential consciousness. Immediately the subject contrasts itself with the object, it develops the sense of selfhood. There is first intelligence and then selfhood. Creation is preceded by a sense of selfhood. " I shall be

by the limitations of the free activity of consciousness. " In the state of consciousness when the ' me ' feels itself limited, then intellect first of all posits or affirms the ' me ' and then opposes to itself the ' not me.' The limitation of the ' me ' implies its previous freedom or unlimitedness." We thus get the finite ego, the non-ego, the limitation, and the absolute self. The ahaṁkāra of the Sāṁkhya belongs to the finite ego. The subtle and the gross elements, as well as their counterparts, the senses, said to be produced by the ego, correspond to the non-ego. The free, unlimited absolute self is the puruṣa and its limitations by the non-ego bondage. But since the absolutely free puruṣa cannot be the source of limitations, the Sāṁkhya admits the existence of a distinct cause, which in its nature is infinite, and whose finiteness, from its intimate connection with the infinite ego, the ego attributes to itself from ignorance. See *Indian Philosophical Review,* ii. pp. 200 ff.

[1] iii. 11.

[2] Cp. Bṛh. Up., i. 4. 2: Īkṣāncakre (He looked round); Chān. Up., vi. 2. 2: Tad aikṣata (That he saw). Cp. *Bhāgavata*: " What they declare to be the citta, or mind, called Vāsudeva, *i.e.* Viṣṇu, that consists of mahat," yad āhur vāsudevākhyaṁ cittaṁ tan mahadātmakam (iii. 26. 21). See S.P.B., vi. 66.

many; I shall procreate."[1] The obscurity of the Sāṁkhya theory is due to the fact that a psychological report is mixed up with a metaphysical statement. The order of psychological presentation need not be the order of real evolution unless the subject is the ultimate and supreme one. The Sāṁkhya combines with its own presuppositions ideas essentially alien to it taken from the Upaniṣads.

VIII

Space and Time

Every phenomenon of cosmic evolution is characterised by activity, change or motion (parispanda).[2] All things undergo infinitesimal changes of growth and decay. In the smallest instant of time (kṣaṇa) the whole universe undergoes a change. In the empirical world, space and time appear as limited, and are said to arise from ākāśa, when it is conditioned by coexistent things in space and moving bodies in time.

Vijñānabhikṣu says: "Eternal space and time are of the form of prakṛti, or the root-cause of ākāśa, and are only the specific modifications of prakṛti. Hence the universality of space and time is established. . . . But these, space and time, which are limited, are produced from ākāśa through the conjunction of this or that limiting object (upādhi)."[3] Limited space and time are ākāśa itself particularised by this or that limiting object, though they are said to be its effects. Space and time are by themselves abstractions. They are not substances, as the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika thought, but relations binding the events of the development of prakṛti. Events stand in relations of time and space. We have no perception of infinite time or infinite space, and so they are said to be constructed by the understanding. From the limited objects of perception which stand to one another in the relation of antecedence and sequence, we construct an infinite time order to represent the course of evolution. Vyāsa says: "Just as the atom is the minimal limit of matter, so the moment (kṣaṇa) is the minimal limit of time, or the time taken by an atom in motion in order to leave one point and reach the next point is a moment. But the continuous flow of these is a sequence (krama). Moments and the sequences of these cannot be combined into a real (vastu). Thus, time, being of

---

[1] Chān. Up., vi. 2. 3.

[2] Vyaktam sakriyam parispandavat *Tattvakaumudī*, 10. See also Y.B., iii. 13.

[3] S.P.B., ii. 12; ii. 10.

[4] Y.B., iii. 52.

this nature, does not correspond to anything real, but is a product of mind, and follows as a result of perceptions or of words "[1]; but the moment is objective and rests on the sequence.[2] The sequence (krama) has for its essence an uninterrupted succession of moments which is called time (kāla) by experts. Two moments cannot occur simultaneously, since it is impossible that there be a sequence of two things that occur simultaneously. When a later moment succeeds an earlier, there is a sequence. Thus in the present there is a single moment and there are no earlier or later moments. Therefore, there is no combination of them. But those moments which are past and future are to be explained as inherent in the changes (pariṇāma). Accordingly, the whole world passes through change in any single moment;[3] so all those external aspects of the world are relative to this present moment.[4]

The world is neither real nor unreal. It is not unreal, like a man's horn, nor real, since it passes away.[5] It is not, however, to be regarded as indescribable, since such a thing cannot exist.[6] The Sāṁkhya repudiates the view that regards the world as a reflection of what is not,[7] nor is the world a mere idea.[8] The world exists in its eternal form of prakṛti and passes away in its transitory manifestations.[9] The world has phenomenal reality as undergoing transformations.[10] Cosmic process is twofold in character, creative as well as destructive. Creation is the unfolding of the different orders from the original prakṛti, and destruction is the dissolution of them into the original prakṛti. As a result of the disturbance of the condition of equilibrium, the universe is evolved with its different elements, and at the close of the world-period the products return by a reverse movement into the preceding stage of development, and so finally into prakṛti. Prakṛti remains in this condition until the time arrives for the development of a new universe. This cycle of evolution and reabsorption has never had a beginning and will never have an end. The play of prakṛti does not cease when this

[1] Sa khalv ayaṁ kālo vastuśūnyo 'pi buddhinirmāṇaḥ śabdajñānānupātī.

[2] Kṣaṇastu vastu patitah kramāvalambī. [Y.B.

[3] Tenaikena kṣaṇena kṛtsno lokaḥ pariṇāmam anubhavati.

[4] So the Yogis can perceive directly both the moments and their sequence (Y.B., iii. 52).

[5] S.P.S., v. 52–53.

[6] S.P.S., v. 54.

[7] S.P.S., v. 55.

[8] S.P.S., i. 42.

[9] Sadasatkhyātir bādhābādhāt (S.P.S., v. 56).

[10] S.P.B., i. 26.

or that individual attains release,[1] though the emancipated are unaffected by the action of prakṛti. Though prakṛti is one only, and common to all puruṣas, it manifests itself in many ways: to the souls in bondage it evolves into many a form from the subtlest to the grossest; and to the freed it retraces its steps and becomes resolved into its own primeval form. So long as there are spectators, the play of prakṛti goes on. When all souls are set free, the play is over and the actors retire.[2] But as there will be always souls struggling to escape out of entanglement in prakṛti, the continuous rhythm of prakṛti's activity will be maintained for ever. Saṁsāra will never reach its end.[3] Since the state of dissolution is the normal condition, in the state of evolution there is a tendency to lapse into dissolution. When the desires of all puruṣas require that there should be a temporary cessation of all experience, prakṛti returns to its quiescent state. The guṇas are so finely opposed that no one becomes predominant. There is therefore no generation of new things and qualities. Even the state of pralaya is intended to serve the interests of puruṣas. In the state of pralaya, prakṛti is not inactive, though its changes are homogeneous.

IX

Puruṣa

All organic beings have a principle of self-determination, to which the name of "soul" is generally given. In the strict sense of the word, "soul" belongs to every being that has life in it, and the different souls are fundamentally identical in nature. The differences are due to the physical organisations that obscure and thwart the life of the soul. The nature of the bodies in which the souls are incorporated accounts for their various degrees of obscuration. The souls cannot be referred to the same principle from which physical organisations spring. So the Sāṁkhya asserts the existence of puruṣas freed from all the accidents of finite life and lifted

[1] S.P.S., iii. 66.
[2] S.K., 58–59; S.P.S., iii. 63.
[3] Y.S., ii. 22; S.P.B., ii. 4; S.P.B., i. 159; i. 67; vi. 68. 69.

above time and change. There is the testimony of consciousness that, though the individual is in one aspect a particular finite being subject to all the accidents and changes of mortality, there is something in him which lifts him above them all. He is not the mind, life or body, but the informing and sustaining soul, silent, peaceful, eternal, that possesses them. When the facts of the world are viewed from the epistemological point of view, we get a classification into subjects on the one side and objects on the other. The relation between any subject and any object is that of cognition or, more broadly, experience. The Sāṁkhya regards the s puruṣa and the known as prakṛti.

The Sāṁkhya puts forward several arguments to establish the existence of puruṣas [1]: (1) The aggregate of things must exist for the sake of another. Gauḍapāda says that even as a bed, which is an assemblage of different parts, is for the use of the man who sleeps upon it, so " this world, which is an assemblage of the five elements, is for another's use; there is a self for whose enjoyment this enjoyable body, consisting of intellect and the rest, has been produced." (2) All knowable objects have the three guṇas, and they presuppose a self who is their seer devoid of the guṇas. (3) There must be a presiding power, a pure consciousness which co-ordinates all experiences. (4) Since prakṛti is non-intelligent, there must be someone to experience the products of prakṛti. (5) There is the striving for liberation (kaivalya), which implies the existence of a puruṣa with qualities opposed to those of prakṛti. The longing for escape from the conditions of existence means the reality of one that can effect the escape.

What is the nature of the self or the subject consciousness? It is not the body. Consciousness is not a product of the elements, since it is not present in them separately, and so cannot be present in them all together.[2] It is different from the senses,[3] since the latter are the instruments of seeing and not the seer. The senses bring about modifications in buddhi. Puruṣa is different from buddhi, since the latter is non-conscious. The consolidation of our experiences into a

[1] S.K., 17; S.P.S., i. 66; Y.S., iv. 24.
[2] S.P.S., v. 129; iii. 20–21.
[3] S.P.S., ii. 29.

systematic whole is due to the presence of the self, which holds the different conscious states together. The self is defined as pure spirit, different from the body, or prakṛti.[1] If it were liable to change, knowledge would be impossible. As its character is consciousness, it helps to bring the products of the evolutionary chain into self-consciousness. It illuminates the whole sphere of thought and feeling. If puruṣa underwent transformation, then it would lapse at times, and there would be no security that the states of prakṛti, as pleasure and pain, will be experienced. Puruṣa's nature as unfailing light (sadāprakāśasvarūpa) does not change.[2] It is present in dreamless sleep,[3] as well as in states of waking and dreaming, which are all the modifications of buddhi.[4] So puruṣa exists, though it is neither cause nor effect.[5] It is the light by which we see that there is such a thing as prakṛti. It does not depend on anything else for illuminating objects. Prakṛti and its products are not self-manifested, but depend for their manifestation on the light of puruṣa. Consciousness, though physically mediated, is not physically explained. Buddhi, manas, and the like, are the instruments or the means; they cannot explain the end of consciousness which they subserve. Puruṣa is only consciousness and not bliss, for happiness is due to the sattva guṇa, which belongs to the side of prakṛti. The duality of subject-object is involved in pleasurable experiences as much as in painful ones. Pleasure and pain belong to the buddhi.[6] Moreover, the presence of bliss in addition to consciousness would introduce duality into the nature of puruṣa.[7] If pain constitutes the nature of puruṣa, no liberation is possible. Puruṣa is incapable of movement, and on attaining release it does not go anywhere.[8] It is not of limited size, since then it would be made up of parts and so be destructible.[9] It is not of atomic size, for then it is not possible to account for its cognition of all bodily states. It does not participate in any activity. The Sāṁkhya denies the puruṣa all qualities, since otherwise it would not be capable of emancipation. The nature of a thing is

[1] S.P.S., vi. 1–2. [2] S.P.B., i. 75; Y.S., iv. 18; S.P.S., i. 146. [3] S.P.S., i. 148. [4] S.P.B., i. 148. [5] S.P.S., i. 61. [6] S.P.S., vi. 11. [7] v. 66. [8] S.P.S., i. 49. S.K., 3. [9] i. 50.

inalienable, and happiness and misery cannot belong to the soul.

There are many selves, since experience shows that men are differently endowed physically, morally and intellectually. There are many conscious beings in the world, each regarding the world in his own way, and with an independent experience of its subjective and objective processes. The differences of outlook cannot be due to the operations of prakṛti, and so it is argued that there are different witnessing consciousnesses. These have different organs and actions and undergo separate birth and death.[1] One goes to heaven, the other goes to hell. The Sāṁkhya lays stress on the numerical distinctness of the streams of consciousness as well as the individual unity of the separate streams. While we cannot account for the organised unity of the individual's experiences apart from the assumption of an individual subject, the distinctness of the different unities makes for a plurality of selves. If the self were one, all should become free if any one attained freedom.[2] If the self is opposed in nature to prakṛti, which is one and common to all, the plurality of selves follows. The passages of the scriptures which support monism are interpreted as referring to the non-difference of essential properties.[3] They imply non-difference in kind and not homogeneity.[4] Freedom is not coalescence with an absolute spirit, but isolation from prakṛti. The selves lodged in the several individuals have the common property of being the silent spectators of the proceedings of the products of prakṛti with which they are temporarily connected.

The Sāṁkhya view of puruṣa is determined by the conception of Ātman in the Upaniṣads.[5] It is without beginning or end, without any qualities, subtle and omnipresent, an eternal seer, beyond the senses, beyond the mind, beyond the sweep of intellect, beyond the range of time, space and causality, which form the warp and woof of the mosaic of the empirical world. It is unproduced and unproducing. Its eternity is not merely everlastingness, but immutability and

[1] S P.S., vi. 45; i 149 and 150.
[2] S.K., 18.
[3] S.P.S., v. 61; S.P.B., i. 154
[4] Vaidharmyaviraha, and not akhaṇḍatā
[5] Bṛh. Up., iv. 3. 16; Śvet., vi 11 and 19; *Amṛtabindu*, v. 10.

perfection. It is of the form of consciousness (cidrūpa), though it does not know all things in the empirical sense, for empirical cognition is possible only through the limitations of body. When the self is set free from these limits, it has no cognition of modifications, but remains in its own nature.[1] Puruṣa is unrelated to prakṛti.[2] It is mere witness, a solitary, indifferent, passive spectator.[3] The characteristics of prakṛti and puruṣa are opposed in nature. Prakṛti is non-consciousness (acetanam), while puruṣa is consciousness (sacetanam). Prakṛti is active and ever-revolving, while puruṣa is inactive (akartā). Puruṣa is unalterably constant, while prakṛti is so alterably. Prakṛti is characterised by the three guṇas, while puruṣa is devoid of the guṇas; prakṛti is the object, while puruṣa is the subject.

X

THE EMPIRICAL INDIVIDUAL

The Jīva is the self distinguished by the conjunction of the senses and limited by the body.[4] Vijñānabhikṣu says that puruṣa with ahaṁkāra is the jīva, and not puruṣa in itself.[5] While the pure self remains beyond buddhi, the reflection of puruṣa in buddhi appears as the ego, the cogniser of all our states, pleasures and pains included. We have the notion of self in buddhi when we do not know that the self is beyond buddhi and different from it in character and knowledge.[6] Each buddhi, with its grasp of senses and the like, is an isolated organism determined by its past karma,[7] and has its own peculiarly associated ignorance (avidyā). The ego is the psychological unity of that stream of conscious experiencing which constitutes what we know as the inner life of an empirical self. This unity is a temporal one, which is ever changing, and not the puruṣa, which is timelessly

[1] S.P.S., Vṛtti, vi. 59.
[2] Bṛh. Up., iv. 3. 15.
[3] S.K., 19. Cp. Maṇibhadra on Haribhadra's *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*. 41.

Amūrtaś cetano bhogī nityaḥ sarvagato 'kriyaḥ
Akartā nirguṇaḥ sūkṣma ātmā kāpiladarśane.

[4] S.P.S., Vṛtti, vi. 63.
[5] S.P.B., vi. 63.
[6] Y.S., ii. 6.
[7] S.P.B., ii. 46.

present as the presupposition of the temporal unity. While the puruṣa is the self which is eternally one with itself, the jīva is an item in the natural world. The egos are existences in a world of existences and alongside of them, and are no more ultimately real than material things. The egos may be experienced by us as other existences are, though differently from them. Every ego possesses within the gross material body, which suffers dissolution at death, a subtle body formed of the psychical apparatus, including the senses. This subtle body is the basis of rebirth,[1] as well as the principle of personal identity in the various existences. The subtle body, which retains the traces of all our experiences, is called the liṅga, or the mark distinguishing the puruṣa. The liṅgas are the empirical characteristics without which the different puruṣas cannot be distinguished. As products of prakṛti, they have the three guṇas. The specific character of the liṅga depends on the combination of the guṇas. Each life-history has its own liṅga. So long as the subtle body is present, there will be embodied existence and rebirth. In the lowest animal stage the tamas predominates, since we notice that the life of an animal is characterised by ignorance and stupidity. The faculties of memory and imagination are but imperfectly developed, so that the pleasure or pain experienced by the animals is neither long nor intense. Since the sattva nature is very low, the knowledge of animals is but a means to present action. When rajas becomes more predominant, the puruṣa enters the human world. The human beings are restless, and strive for liberation and freedom from pain. When sattva predominates, the saving knowledge is obtained, and prakṛti no longer binds the ego to the misery of existence. The released soul is a disinterested spectator of the world show. At death, the bond between puruṣa and prakṛti is dissolved, and the released soul is freed absolutely. The changes, *i.e.* release and bondage, belong to the subtle body attached to the puruṣa, which ever remains pure consciousness, though it forgets its true nature so long as the subtle body abounds in rajas and tamas. The puruṣas in all the subtle bodies are of the same kind, and the subtle bodies themselves which differentiate them belong to one continuous

[1] S.P.S., iii. 16.

evolution in prakṛti. The evolution hypothesis links man in blood relationship with every other form of life, animal as well as vegetable.

The empirical self is the mixture of free spirit and mechanism, of puruṣa and prakṛti. Through the union of puruṣa and prakṛti, the subtle body, which is a product of prakṛti, becomes conscious, though it is in itself non-conscious. It is subject to pleasure and pain, action and its fruits, and rotates in the round of rebirth. The ātman or the puruṣa is quite indifferent to worldly concerns. Activity belongs to the buddhi, one of the products of prakṛti; nevertheless, on account of its union with puruṣa, the indifferent puruṣa appears as an actor. Actual agency belongs to antaḥkaraṇa, or the inner organ, which is lighted up by puruṣa.[1] The unconscious antaḥkaraṇa cannot by itself be the agent, but it is invested with consciousness. This investment or illumination of antaḥkaraṇa consists in a particular conjunction of it with consciousness, which is eternally shining; consciousness does not pass into the antaḥkaraṇa, but is only reflected in it. This conjunction of puruṣa with prakṛti is of course not a permanent one. Puruṣa allies itself with prakṛti in order that the nature of the latter may be revealed to itself and that it may attain freedom from association with prakṛti. Prakṛti underlies both psychical and physical phenomena. Its constituents behave in the one case as the subject or the perceiver, and in the other as the object or the perceived. The two represent different orders of development.[2] Prakṛti acts and puruṣa enjoys the fruits of action. Happiness and misery belong to the modes of prakṛti, and puruṣa is said to experience them through its ignorance.[3] The light of consciousness is attributed to the workings of prakṛti; and puruṣa, passively observing the workings of prakṛti, forgets its true nature, and is deluded into the belief that it thinks, feels and acts. It identifies itself with a particular finite form of existence, animal body, and is thus shut out from

[1] S.P.S., i. 99.

[2] Cp. Vācaspati: "Guṇānāṁ dvairūpyaṁ vyavaseyātmakatvam, vyavasāyātmakatvaṁ ca. Tatra vyavaseyātmakatāṁ grāhyatām āsthāya pañcatanmātrāṇi bhūtabhautikāni . . . vyavasāyātmakatvaṁ tu grahaṇasvarūpam āsthāya sāhaṁkārāṇīndriyāṇi" (*Tattvavaiśāradī*, iii. 47).

[3] *Tattvakaumudī*, 5.

the true life. Losing the peace of eternity, it enters the unrest of time. Puruṣa does not move, though the body which invests it moves from place to place. Puruṣa, which is passive and supposed to give consent or withdrawal, is but a name for a movement which takes place in prakṛti. Though not an agent, the puruṣa appears as an agent, through confusion with the agency of prakṛti, even as prakṛti through proximity to puruṣa appears to be conscious.[1] The experience of pain (duḥkhasākṣātkāra) is only in the form of reflection, which is of the modification (vṛtti) of the upādhi.[2] The real bondage is of the citta, while only its shadow falls on the puruṣa.

The narrow and limited existence of the jīva is not due to the essential nature of the soul as puruṣa; it is the result of a fall from its original estate. The experience of puruṣa means only the reception of the reflections of objects.[3] When prakṛti acts, the puruṣa experiences the fruits, since the activity of prakṛti is intended for the experience of puruṣa.[4] Strictly speaking, even this experiencing is due to abhimāna (sense of selfhood), born of aviveka (non-discrimination).[5] When the truth is known, there is neither pleasure nor pain, neither agency nor enjoyment.[6]

The Sāṁkhya account of puruṣa and jīva resembles in many respects the Advaita Vedānta account of the ātman and the individual ego. The ātman, according to the Advaita Vedānta, is free from action, from the encumbrances of body and mind which involve us in action. The ātman seems to act on account of its accidents. The unconditioned puruṣa or ātman is regarded as jīva, when it is confused with the narrow bounds of individuality. Strictly speaking, individuality belongs to the sūkṣmaśarīra in the Advaita and the liṅgaśarīra in the Sāṁkhya. Vijñānabhikṣu speaks of a mutual reflection, which is to some extent akin to the pratibimbavāda of the Advaita Vedānta, which holds that the ātman is reflected in the antaḥkaraṇa, or the inner organ. This cidābhāsa, or appearance of cit, is the individual self or jīva.

The Sāṁkhya theory is evidently a compromise between the empirical view of the soul struggling for release and the

[1] S.K., 20 and 22; S.P.S., i. 162–3; Y.S., ii 17; B.G., viii. 21; Kaṭha Up., iii. 4.
[2] S.P.B., i. 17.
[3] Puruṣasya viṣayabhogaḥ pratibimbādānamātram (S.P.B , i. 104).
[4] S.P.S., i. 105
[5] S.P.S., i. 106.
[6] S.P.S., i. 107.

view of the Advaita Vedānta, that the infinite and passionless soul is incapable of submitting to bondage. So, it is said, that though the puruṣa remains in its essence eternally unchanged, still it experiences the reflection of the suffering which goes on. Even as a crystal allows a red flower to be seen through it without itself becoming red, the soul remains unchanged, though the illusion of its suffering or joy may be present in consciousness. Vijñānabhikṣu quotes a verse from the *Sūrya Purāna* to the effect: "As a pure crystal is observed by people to be red on account of the superimposition of some red-coloured stuff, so is the great puruṣa."[1] Śaṁkara uses the analogy of the crystal vase which appears red on account of the red flowers in it, though it is itself devoid of any taint or tinge.[2] If the puruṣa appears affected or disturbed, this appearance is due to the mind with which it is for a time associated. The association does not leave any permanent or temporary impression on the self. Since there is no real contact, there are no traces left behind.

XI

Puruṣa and Prakṛti

The most perplexing point of the Sāṁkhya system is the problem of the relation between puruṣa and prakṛti. We have already seen that the evolution of prakṛti has not only a certain glamour, but has also a design in its adaptation to the realisation of spiritual ends.[3] Prakṛti evolves a world full of woe and desolation to raise the soul from its slumber. The unrolling of the tragedy of the world is said to be necessary for the self, which remains inactive, though it sees all that is presented to it. Serviceability to puruṣa is acknowledged

[1] Yathā hi kevalo raktaḥ sphatiko lakṣyate janaiḥ
Rañjakādyupadhānena tadvat paramapūruṣaḥ. (S.P.B., i. 19.)

The puruṣa, passively indifferent, appears as if he were an agent owing to the influence of the three guṇas. Cp.

Prakṛteḥ kāryaṁ nityaikā prakṛtir jaḍā
Prakṛtes triguṇāveśād udāsīno 'pi kartṛvad. (S.S.S.S., ix. 15.)

[2] *Ātmabodha.*

[3] S.P S., ii. 1; iii. 58.

to be the end of the activities of prakṛti,[1] though parkṛti is not conscious of this end. While the Sāṁkhya eliminates mythological miracle-working, it admits a [illegible] ology. It is a sublime thought to trace the grandeur of the cosmos and the marvellous arrangement of the world to the activity of prakṛti, which, though mechanical, effects results which suggest strongly the wisest computation of sagacity. But the Sāṁkhya is clear that the activity of prakṛti is not due to conscious reflection.[2] The analogies employed by the Sāṁkhya do not carry us very far. The non-intelligent prakṛti is said to act even as the non-intelligent trees grow fruits,[3] or even as the milk of the cow is secreted for the purpose of nourishing the calf. Mechanism does not explain itself, nor can the products of prakṛti be regarded as the mechanical results of the lower conditions. If prakṛti were spontaneously active, then there can be no liberation, since its activity will be unceasing; if it were spontaneously inactive, then the course of mundane existence would at once cease to go on. The Sāṁkhya admits that the activity of prakṛti implies a mover not itself in motion, though it produces movement. The evolution of prakṛti implies spiritual agency. But the spiritual centres admitted by the Sāṁkhya are incapable of exerting any direct influence on prakṛti; the Sāṁkhya says that the mere presence of the puruṣas excites prakṛti to activity and development. Though puruṣa is not endowed with creative might, prakṛti, which produces the manifold universe, is so on account of its union with puruṣa. Prakṛti is blind, but with the guidance of puruṣa it produces the manifold world. The union of the two is compared to a lame man of good vision mounted on the shoulders of a blind man of sure foot.[4] The collective

[1] S.K., 56. The Sāṁkhya view of prakṛti is different from the view of nature popularised by Huxley in his Romanes Lecture or by Hardy's lines :—

"... Some Vast Imbecility,
Mighty to build and blend,
But Impotent to tend.
... An Automaton,
Unconscious of our pains."

[2] S.P.S., iii. 61.

[3] S.P.S., Vṛtti, ii. 1.

[4] S.K., 21. Gauḍapāda says: "As a lame man and a blind man, deserted by their fellow travellers, who, in making their way with difficulty

influence of the innumerable selves which contemplate the movement of prakṛti is responsible for the evolution of the latter. The disturbance of the equilibrium of the guṇas which sets up the process of evolution is due to the action of the puruṣas on prakṛti.[1] The presence of the puruṣas disturbs the balance of the forces which keep each other at rest. At the beginning of the evolutionary process we have prakṛti in a state of quiescence and numberless puruṣas equally quiescent, but exerting on prakṛti a mechanical force. This upsets the equilibrium of prakṛti and initiates a movement which, at first, takes the form of development and, later, of decay and collapse. Prakṛti, again, returns to its quiescent condition, to be again excited by the puruṣas. The process will continue until all the selves are freed. So the first cause, as well as the final cause, of the cosmic process is puruṣa. But the causation of puruṣa is purely mechanical, being due not to its volition but to its mere proximity. Puruṣa moves the world by a kind of action which is not movement. It is compared to the attraction of a magnet for iron.[2] The puruṣa of the Sāṁkhya is not unlike the God of Aristotle. Though Aristotle affirms a transcendant God as the origin of the motion of the world, he denies to his God any activity within the world. God, according to Aristotle, is a purely contem-

through a forest, had been dispersed by robbers, happening to encounter each other, and entering into conversation so as to inspire mutual confidence, agreed to divide between them the duties of walking and of seeing. Accordingly, the lame man was mounted on the blind man's shoulders, and was thus carried on his journey, whilst the blind man was enabled to pursue his route by the directions of his companion. In the same manner the faculty of seeing is in the soul, though not that of moving—it is like the lame man; the faculty of moving is in prakṛti, but not of seeing, which resembles, therefore, the blind man. Further, as a separation takes place between the lame man and the blind man, when their mutual object is accomplished and when they have reached the end of the journey, so prakṛti, having effected the liberation of the puruṣa, ceases to act; and puruṣa, having contemplated prakṛti, obtains freedom; and so, their respective purposes being effected, the connection between them is dissolved" (*Bhāṣya* on *Kārikā*, p. 21).

Any system of constructive evolutionary philosophy needs an organ- a nisus or an elan. Alexander, who gets down at the base of the pyramid to a kind of space-time, makes time the energising factor Hobhouse, in his preface to the second edition of *Mind in Evolution*, urges that mind in some form is the driving force of all evolution. Lloyd Morgan attributes this function to God in his *Emergent Evolution*.

[2] S.K., 57; S.P.S., i. 96.

plative being shut up within himself, so that he can neither act upon the universe nor take cognisance of it. God, the first mover, is said to move the world by being the object after which the whole creation strives, and not as if it were in any way determined by his action. Concern with the affairs of the world would destroy the completeness of God's life. So God, who is pure intelligence, though himself unmoved, moves the world by his mere being. The further development of things arises from their own nature. But puruṣa is said to be outside prakṛti, and its influence on prakṛti, though real, is unintelligible. The relation between the two is a mystery which encompasses us, though we cannot penetrate it.[1] We cannot say that prakṛti acts with reference to the end of the puruṣas, since the latter are eternally free and are incapable of enjoying the activities of prakṛti. It follows that the activities of prakṛti are meant for the consumption of the jīvas, who, on account of imperfect insight, identify themselves with their liṅgaśarīras, or subtle bodies, possess desires and stand in need of discriminative knowledge. So prakṛti produces beings who are bound to suffer in order to give them an opportunity of extricating themselves.[2]

The real puruṣa has relations with a real world on account of a fancied relation between the two. So long as this fancied relation subsists, prakṛti acts towards it. When the puruṣa recognises its distinction from the ever-evolving and dissolving

[1] Cp. S.B., ii. 2. 6. Śaṁkara, discussing the question of the purpose of the activities of prakṛti, whether it is the enjoyment (bhoga) or release (mokṣa) of souls, says: "If enjoyment, what enjoyment can belong to the soul incapable of any accretion (of pleasure or pain)? Moreover, there would in that case be no opportunity for release (since the soul as inactive cannot aim at release, while pradhāna aims only at the soul's undergoing varied experience). If the object were release, the activity of pradhāna would be purposeless, since even antecedent to it the soul is in the state of release. If both enjoyment and release, then, on account of the infinite number of the objects of pradhāna to be enjoyed by the soul, there would be no opportunity for final release. Nor can the satisfaction of a desire be regarded as the purpose of the activity of pradhāna, since neither the non-intelligent pradhāna nor the essentially pure soul can feel any desire. If, finally, you assume that the pradhāna is active, since otherwise the power of sight (belonging to the soul as intelligence) and the creative power (of the pradhāna) would be purposeless, it would follow that, since the two do not cease at any time, the apparent world would never come to an end, so that final release of the soul is impossible."

[2] S.P.S., Vṛtti, ii. 1.

world of prakṛti, the latter ceases to operate towards it.[1] The efficient cause of prakṛti's development is not the mere presence of the puruṣas, for they are always present, but their non-discrimination.

Prior to the transformation of prakṛti into mahat, etc., there is only non-discrimination. Adṛṣṭa, or unseen merit or demerit, is as yet unproduced, since it is a product of mahat and appears subsequent to the initial action of prakṛti. Adṛṣṭa, acquired in the previous creation, is of no help, since it is different for different individuals, and at the moment of creation the different adṛṣṭas are not distributed to the different selves. In the last analysis, the cause of the activity of prakṛti is non-discrimination,[2] since the connection with karma is only an effect of non-discrimination.[3] This non-discrimination brings about a temporary union between puruṣa and prakṛti; the union, however, is not real, since it dissolves on the rise of true knowledge.

Prakṛti has caught puruṣas somehow in her web. No cause is assigned to account for the original entanglement of the eternal souls, once free, in the equally eternal prakṛti. Only the fact is noticed that the puruṣas are caught in the meshes of prakṛti apparently without their consent. It is due to non-discrimination which has no f it had a beginning, then, prior to it, the souls would en in release and after it, in bondage. This would mean the bondage of the released.

We cannot say by what avidyā is caused. So it is regarded as beginningless, though it may have an end.[4] Aviveka is said to be the cause of the conjunction (saṁyoga) between puruṣa and prakṛti.[5] The former, which is the cause, exists even in pralaya or dissolution, though not the latter. This conjunction is not a real change (pariṇāma), since no new properties are produced in the puruṣa. The relation between the two is sometimes viewed as that of the enjoyer and the enjoyable.[6]

XII

Puruṣa and Buddhi

Of all the evolutes of prakṛti, buddhi is the most important. The senses present their objects to buddhi, which exhibits them to puruṣa. It is buddhi that discriminates the difference

[1] S.K., 61; S.P.S., iii. 70.
[2] Y.S., ii. 24.
[3] S.P S., iii. 67.
[4] See S.P.S., vi. 12–15.
[5] S.P.B., i. 19; Y.S., ii. 23–24.
[6] S.P.B., i. 19. Vijñānabhikṣu disputes it on the ground that if the relation is eternal, it cannot be terminated by knowledge, and if it is non-eternal, it may as well be called conjunction (saṁyoga).

between puruṣa and prakṛti and accomplishes, for puruṣa, the fruition of all that is to be experienced.[1] Buddhi, by means of the reflection of puruṣa, which is adjacent to it, becomes verily of its form and accomplishes its experience of all objects. Though buddhi is a product of prakṛti and so non-conscious in character, still it appears as if intelligent.[2] Puruṣa does not transfer its characteristics of consciousness to buddhi. " Because of the transparency of prakṛti in her sattva part, the puruṣa reflected therein mistakes the sense of selfhood and agency (abhimāna) of prakṛti as belonging to itself. This misconception is in the self also as reflected in prakṛti and not in the self as such; even as the motionless moon reflected in water moves through the motion of water."[3] Vācaspati holds that there can be no contact (saṁyoga) between puruṣa and the state of buddhi, since they belong to two different orders of reality; and so it is said that there is a reflection of puruṣa in buddhi which makes the latter conscious. The ego is the seeming unity of buddhi and puruṣa. When puruṣa sees there is a modification of buddhi simultaneous with it. When buddhi suffers modification, it catches a glimpse of puruṣa, so that the contact (saṁyoga) of puruṣa and prakṛti is simultaneous with the unity of the reflecting puruṣa and the particular transformation of buddhi. The relation between puruṣa and prakṛti associated with it is such that whatever mental phenomena happen in the mind are interpreted as the experiences of the puruṣa. Even non-discrimination belongs to buddhi, and in bondage it is reflected in puruṣa.[4]

Puruṣa is said to be immediately connected with the buddhi pertaining to it, and indirectly with the rest. So Vijñānabhikṣu says that while puruṣa is the sākṣin of buddhi, *i.e.* the witness of the states of buddhi without any intermediary, it is the beholder (draṣṭā) of others through the aid of buddhi. The free and indifferent puruṣa becomes the sākṣin when connected with buddhi.[5] If a real connection

[1] S.K., 37; S.P.B., i. 161.

[2] Cetanāvad iva (S.K, 20). See also S.K., 60.

[3] S.P.S., Vṛtti, vi. 59.

[4] Cp. S.P.B., i. 19. " Birth means conjunction with an individual buddhi. It is by reason of the conjunction of buddhi as an upādhi that conjunction of pain takes place in the puruṣa."

[5] S P.S., vi. 50.

between soul and body is asserted, then the imperfections of the latter will have to be attributed to the former. This will prejudice the Sāṁkhya theory of the essential purity of the soul. Bondage is the reflection in puruṣa of the impurities of buddhi. Release is the removal of this reflection consequent on the recovery by buddhi of its original purity, *i.e.* dissolution into prakṛti. To say that the activity of prakṛti is for the benefit of puruṣa is a figurative way of saying that it is for the purification of buddhi. While buddhi is in itself sāttvika, in any individual it is rājasa or tāmasa, on account of the contaminating influences of its past life. The feeling of pain or pleasure which we experience arises from the interaction of buddhi and the objective world with puruṣa as the onlooker. While buddhi should give rise only to pleasure, on account of the play of its acquired influences, it brings about painful results. This is why the same thing affects different persons differently. Every object apprehended is viewed through the distracting medium of individual purpose. Thus, what is pleasant to one is unpleasant to another, or to the same person at a different time. We generally live in worlds of our own, where we over-estimate our particular needs and purposes and set a conventional value on our preferences. Our ordinary lives are bound up with our selfish desires and give rise to pain mixed with some amount of uncertain pleasure. If we purify our buddhi, get rid of our past tendencies, then we shall be in a position to look at things, not as related to us, but as related among themselves, *i.e.* absolutely. When buddhi is dominated by sattva, it gives rise to true knowledge; by rajas, to desire; and by tamas, to false knowledge and the like.[1]

XIII

The Mechanism of Knowledge

In all knowledge, three factors are involved: the object known, the subject knowing, and the process of knowledge. In the Sāṁkhya philosophy "the pure consciousness is the

[1] Sattvaṁ yathārthajñānahetuḥ, rajo rāgahetuḥ, tamo viparītajñānādihetuḥ.

knower (pramātṛ); the modification (vṛtti) is the pramāṇa; pramā is the reflection in consciousness of the modifications in the form of the objects. The knowable is the subject matter of the reflected modifications."[1] Experience belongs to puruṣa.[2] Buddhi (intellect), ahaṁkāra (self-sense), manas (mind), and the senses constitute the apparatus by means of which the external object is apprehended by the subject. When an object excites the senses, the manas[3] arranges the sense-impressions into a percept, the self-sense refers it to the self, and the buddhi forms the concept.[4] Buddhi, spread over the whole body, contains the impressions (saṁskāras) and tendencies (vāsanās) of past lives, which are revived under suitable conditions. "By means of the contact with objects through the channels of the senses, or by means of the knowledge of the inferential mark and the like, is first produced a modification of buddhi in the form of the object to be cognised. This modification, tinged with the object, enters on (the field of union of) the puruṣa by the form of a reflection and shines there, since puruṣa, who is not liable to transformation, cannot possibly be modified into the form of the object." If apprehension of the object means the assumption of the form of the object, such a transformation is not possible with the puruṣa; so buddhi is said to be modified. For the modification to be manifested, there must be the reflection of buddhi in consciousness.[5] This reflection is determined by the modification of the buddhi. The reflection in puruṣa lasts only so long as that which is reflected is present. The reflection in puruṣa of the modification of buddhi is not subsequent to but simultaneous with the modification. When,

[1] S.P.B., i. 87.

[2] S.P.S., i. 143.

[3] Manas is recognised as an eleventh sense for several reasons. If the eternal puruṣa were itself associated with the objects of pleasure and pain, then there could be no liberation. If the connection with objects took place in dependence on prakṛti, then there could be no liberation, since prakṛti is eternal. If the non-eternal objects, jars, etc., were associated with the eternal intelligence of puruṣa, then there could be no such distinction as seen and unseen, since all things now existing would necessarily be seen at one and the same moment. If the association of objects with intelligence depended only on the external organs, we could not account for the non-simultaneous character of our perceptions.

[4] *Tattvakaumudī*, 36. For a criticism of the Sāṁkhya theory of knowledge, see N.V. and N.V.T.T., iii. 2. 8–9.

[5] S.P.B., i. 99.

through the sense-organs, buddhi comes into contact with the external object and is affected by it, it assumes the form of that object. The force of consciousness (cetanāśakti), reflected in the buddhi thus modified, imitates the modification of buddhi; and it is the imitation (tadvṛttyanukāra) that is known as apprehension (upalabdhi). The reflection of the puruṣa is not an actual intercourse, but is only apparent, being due to the failure to perceive the distinction between the puruṣa and buddhi. The connection of the puruṣa, as reflected in the buddhi, with the object is called knowledge, and the connection of the puruṣa with this knowledge is seen in the resulting determination that "I act,"[1] whereas in reality the "I," or puruṣa, cannot act, and what acts, *i.e.* buddhi, cannot think.[2]

No movement of buddhi will be conscious apprehension until it attracts the attention of some puruṣa. This view is intended to bring out the unconscious nature of buddhi, manas and the senses.[3]

The action of the different functions is successive, though, in some, the succession is so rapid as to escape attention. When one sees a tiger in a dark night, one's senses are excited, manas reflects, ahaṁkāra identifies, and the buddhi determines the nature of the object, and one runs away for dear life. Here the different acts take place so quickly that they seem to occur simultaneously. When one sees an object in a dim light, suspects it to be a thief, and slowly makes up one's mind and moves away in an opposite direction, the different stages are discernible.[4]

---

[1] Buddhāv āropitacaitanyasya viṣayeṇa saṁbandho jñānam, jñānena saṁbandhaś cetano'haṁ karomīty upalabdhiḥ (Haridāsa Bhaṭṭācārya on Udayana's *Kusumāñjali*, i. 14).

[2] While Vācaspati thinks that the self knows the object through the mental modification on which it casts its reflection, Vijñānabhikṣu holds that the mental modification which takes in the reflection of the self and assumes its form is reflected back on the self, and it is through this reflection that the self knows the object. *Yogavārttika*, i. 4. *Tattvavaiśāradī*, p. 13.

[3] But in the Sāṁkhya theory there cannot arise buddhi, ahaṁkāra, etc., until there is the pervading influence of puruṣa over prakṛti. It is therefore unnecessary for us to think that buddhi is simply non-conscious. The development of buddhi is itself due to the influence of puruṣa. We need not regard buddhi, ahaṁkāra, etc., as mere instruments ready made for the use of puruṣa, but remaining unconscious and inert, until puruṣas look through them as through a telescope; for this would be to ignore the central principle of the Sāṁkhya that prakṛti cannot give rise to buddhi, etc., until puruṣa disturbs the equilibrium of prakṛti.

[4] S.K., 30; *Tattvakaumudī*, 30.

The psychic functions of perception and thought, desire and choice, are, strictly speaking, mechanical processes of the products of prakṛti, which constitute the inner organs.[1] They would remain unconscious but for the puruṣa which illuminates them, *i.e.* makes them conscious. This is the sole function of puruṣa, since all activity belongs to prakṛti. Puruṣa is a passive mirror in which the inner organ is reflected. The purely immaterial self bathes the processes of the inner organ in its own consciousness, so that they do not remain unconscious. The Sāṁkhya assumes not only the proximity of the puruṣa to buddhi, but also the reflection of puruṣa in buddhi. We cognise the conscious occurrence even as we see the face reflected in a mirror. Only in this way can consciousness have a vision of itself.[2]

The relation between the incorporeal puruṣa and the corporeal buddhi is hard to conceive. According to Vācaspati, there can be no contact between the two on the plane of space and time. He therefore interprets proximity (sannidhi) as fitness (yogyatā). The puruṣa, though it remains aloof from the states of buddhi, falls into the misconception of identifying itself with buddhi and ascribing the states of the latter to itself. Vijñānabhikṣu contends that if such a special kind of fitness is admitted, there is no reason why the puruṣa should lose it at the time of deliverance. In other words, there can be no deliverance, since the puruṣa will continue to experience the states of buddhi for ever. So he holds that there is a real contact of the puruṣa with the modifications of buddhi in any cognitive occurrence. Such a contact need not involve any change in the puruṣa, for change means the rise of new qualities. Buddhi suffers changes, and when these are reflected in the puruṣa there arises the notion of a person or experiencer in the puruṣa, and when the puruṣa is reflected back in the buddhi the state of the latter appears as a conscious occurrence. But even Vijñānabhikṣu allows that the relation between the puruṣa and the buddhi is like

[1] The three inner organs, buddhi, ahaṁkāra and manas, are frequently treated as one, since they are closely related to one another. Cp. Garbe: "This combined material inner organ exactly corresponds as regards its unspiritual nature, and all the functions that the Sāṁkhya doctrine ascribes to it to the nervous system" (E.R.E., vol. ii, p. 191).

[2] Citcchāyāpatti, or the falling of the shadow of consciousness (S.D.S., xv).

that of a crystal to a rose reflected in it; there is no actual transference (uparāga), but only the assumption of such transference (abhimāna).[1]

The puruṣas, though innumerable and universal and of the form of consciousness, do not illumine all things at all times, since they are free from attachment (asaṅga) and cannot by themselves be modified into the form of the objects. The puruṣas reflect the modifications of their respective buddhis and not those of others. That object by which the buddhi is affected is known, while that by which it is not affected is not known.[2]

The different states of waking, dreaming, sleep and death are distinguished. In the waking state, buddhi is modified in the form of objects through the channels of senses; in dreams the modifications of buddhi are the results of the saṁskāras, or the impressions of previous experiences. Dreamless sleep is twofold according as the withdrawal (laya) is partial or complete. In the former condition buddhi is not modified in the form of objects, though it assumes the forms of pleasure, pain and dulness inherent in it. This is why, when one wakes from sleep, one has memory of the kind of sleep one had. In death we have a case of complete laya.[3]

XIV

The Sources of Knowledge

Cognitive consciousness is of five different kinds: pramāṇa, or valid knowledge, viparyaya, or unreal cognition resting on a form not possessed by that which is its object,[4] vikalpa, or cognitive consciousness, induced by conventional expressions though devoid of any object (vastuśūnya),[5] nidrā (sleep), or cognition supported on tamas,[6] and smṛti or remembrance.

The Sāṁkhya accepts the three pramāṇas of perception, inference and scriptural testimony.[7] Knowledge produced through sense-activity is perception. When a thing like a jar comes within the range of vision, buddhi, or the intellect,

[1] S.P.B., vi. 28; Y.S., i. 4, 7. See also Y.B., ii. 20; iv. 22.
[2] S.D.S., xv.
[3] S.P.B., i. 148.
[4] Y.S., i. 8.
[5] Y.S., i. 9.
[6] Y.S., i. 10.
[7] S.K., 4.

is so modified as to assume the form [1] of the jar; and the soul becomes aware of the existence of the jar.[2] The two kinds of perception, indeterminate (nirvikalpaka) and determinate (savikalpaka), are admitted. According to Vācaspati, buddhi comes into touch with external objects through the senses. At the first moment of the contact there is an indeterminate consciousness in which the particular features of the object are not noticed, and we have only indeterminate perception. At the second moment, through the exercise of mental analysis (vikalpa) and synthesis (saṁkalpa), the object is perceived as possessing a definite nature,[3] and we have determinate perception. While Vācaspati thinks that the activity of manas is necessary for perception, Vijñānabhikṣu denies it, and holds that buddhi directly comes into touch with the objects through the senses. Vācaspati assigns to manas the function of arranging the sense-data and ordering them into determinate perceptions, while Vijñānabhikṣu thinks that the determinate character of things is directly perceived by the senses and that manas is only the faculty of desire, doubt and imagination. Yogic perception is admitted by the Sāṁkhya, which holds that all things exist involved or evolved at all times. The mind of the yogin can come into connection with the past and the future objects which exist at present in a latent condition by virtue of certain powers produced by meditation.[4] Yogic perception produced by the powers of mind is unlike ordinary sense-perception. In memory—knowledge, the manas, the self-sense and the intellect alone are active, though their activity presupposes the results of previous perceptions—such as a memory image. While the outer organs of perception can operate only on objects presented to them, manas can deal with the past and the future as well. In the case of internal perception, the co-operation of the sense-organs is lacking. Buddhi perceives the states of pleasure and the like.[5]

[1] Tadākārollekhi.
[2] S.P.S., i. 89.
[3] Cp. Vyāsa: Sāmānyaviśeṣasamudāyo dravyam (Y.B., iii. 44).
[4] S.P.B., i. 91.
[5] "What is manifested in dreamless sleep, when there is no contact with objects, as the sāttvika pleasure of tranquillity (śāntisukham), the same is the property of buddhi, the pleasure of the self (ātmasukham)" (S.P.B.,

Even if puruṣa is knowable, it is because puruṣa is reflected in buddhi. The eye cannot see itself except as it is reflected in a mirror. All cognitions are modifications of the internal organ. A primary cognition such as "This is a jar" is a modification of that organ. When its reflection falls on puruṣa, it is apprehended. The cognition, "I cognise the jar," is a modification of the internal organ. Puruṣa, along with the reflection of the modification of the internal organ, such as "This is a jar," is reflected in the internal organ. This second reflection is the modification of the internal organ. Even the cognition "I am distinct from prakṛti" is a modification of the internal organ.[1] Buddhi changes according to the objects offered to it.

The notion of self, which is connected with all our mental phenomena and which illumines them, is due to the reflection of the self in buddhi. So puruṣa may be said to see again that which was perceived by the buddhi, and so impart consciousness by transferring its illumination to the buddhi as the ego. The puruṣa can know itself only through its reflection in the buddhi, modified into the form of the object. According to Vācaspati, the self can know itself only when attention is entirely withdrawn from the mental function in which the self is reflected, and is wholly concentrated on the reflection of the self in the sattva nature of buddhi. In this act the subject of self-apprehension is said to be buddhi in its sattva nature, rendered conscious by receiving the reflection of puruṣa in it; and the object is the self in its purity.[2] Vyāsa[3] holds that the self cannot be known by the buddhi in which it is reflected, but it is the self which knows itself through its reflection in the pure nature of buddhi. Vijñānabhikṣu thinks that the self knows itself through the reflection in itself of the mental modification, which takes in the reflection of the self and is modified into its form, even as it knows an external object through the reflection in itself of the mental modification which assumes the form of the object.[4] Since the self is essentially self-luminous, it can know itself through the reflection in itself of the mental mode which assumes the form of the self. Vijñānabhikṣu regards the self as determined by the mental mode which is modified into the form of the self as the subject, and the self in its pure essence as the object.

Pratyabhijñā or recognition is brought under perception. It is possible because buddhi is eternal, and quite different from the momentary cognitions of individuals. The eternal buddhi undergoes modifications, by virtue of which it becomes connected with the different cognitions involved in recognition. This would not be possible of the self which is unmodifiable.[5]

[1] Y.S., ii. 20, reads: "The self as seer is absolute in its purity, yet is capable of being perceived in experience" (pratyayānupaśyah).

[2] *Tattvavaiśāradī*, iii. 35. [3] Y.B., iii. 35. [4] *Yogavārttika*, iii. 35.

[5] For a criticism of the theory, see N.S., iii. 2. 1–9.

According to the Sāṁkhya, a cognition is not perceived by another cognition, but is perceived by the self. For cognition is regarded as a function of the buddhi, which is unconscious, and so it cannot be its own object, but can only be apprehended by the self.[1]

Negation (abhāva) is also mentioned under perception. The Sāṁkhya does not admit negation as such, but interprets it in terms of the positive. Mere non-perception cannot prove non-existence, since it may be due to other causes, such as long distance, excessive nearness, extreme subtlety, or disturbance of sense-organs, inattention, concealment of the object, and mixture with other things.[2] Internal perception, self-consciousness, recognition and knowledge of non-existence are treated as falling under perception.

Inference is said to be of two kinds: affirmative (vīta) and negative (avīta). The former is based on affirmative concomitance and the latter on negative concomitance.[3] The five-membered form of the syllogism is admitted.[4] Generalisation is the result of the observation of the accompaniment attended with the non-observation of non-accompaniment.[5] Vyāpti, which is constant concomitance, is not a separate principle.[6] It is a relation of things, but not itself a thing.[7] Arthāpatti or implication, and saṁbhava or subsumption, are included under inference.

Āptavacana or trustworthy assertion, is also a source of valid knowledge. A word is related to its object as a sign to the thing signified. This is evident from the instruction of the trustworthy, the law of use and wont, conventions and the fact of their possessing the same denotation.[8] The Vedas are not said to be the composition of persons, since there are not any persons who can be their authors.[9] The released have no concern with the Vedas, and the unreleased are not

[1] Y.B., iv. 9. [2] See also *Tattvavaiśāradī*, i. 9. S.K., 7; S.P.S., i. 108 9.

[3] Vācaspati brings the pūrvavat and sāmānyatodṛṣṭa kinds under the former and śeṣavat under the latter. See *Tattvakaumudī*, 5.

[4] S.P.S., v. 27.

[5] S.P.S., Vṛtti, v. 28. Constant coexistence of both the sādhya and sādhana or of one is vyāpti (S.P.S., v. 29). All produced objects are non-eternal is a case of the former, while "all smoky things are fiery" is a case of the latter.

[6] Tattvāntaram, v. 30. Pañcaśikha is of opinion that vyāpti is the possession of the power of that which is sustained (*Ādheyaśaktiyoga*, v. 32).

[7] v. 33-35. [8] S.P.S., Vṛtti, v. 38. [9] S.P.S., v. 46.

competent for the work.[1] Nor are the Vedas eternal, since they possess the character of effects. Letters perish after they are pronounced. When we say "It is the same letter," we mean that it belongs to the same genus.[2] Simply because the Vedas are not of personal origin, we cannot infer that they are eternal, since a sprout is not eternal, though it has not a personal origin.[3] Their objects are supersensuous, yet "there can be intuition even in the case of supersensuous objects, by means of the universal forms which determine the character of being a padārtha, or an object denoted by a word."[4] Though the Vedas are not of personal authorship, their natural power to denote objects is communicated by āptas to their disciples.[5] The Veda, on account of its non-personal authorship, is free from doubts and discrepancies, and is regarded as of self-evident validity. If the validity of the Vedas depended on something else, they would not be authoritative for us.[6] Kapila, at the beginning of the kalpa, only remembered it. The scriptural statements are tested and lived by the muktas or the liberated, who pass them on to others. If those who teach us the śāstras are not inspired seers, but have accepted them at second-hand, then it would be a case of the blind leading the blind.[7] We accept the utterances of the āptas as valid, since their authority is established by the tested validity of their sayings in other branches of knowledge as āyurveda.[8]

The Sāṁkhya is aware that there are other systems which profess to be revealed, and so argues that reason will have to be employed in finding out which codes of revelation are true and which not. Vācaspati says: "The invalidity of these systems is due to their making unreasonable assertions, to the lack of sufficient support, to their making statements opposed to the canons of logic, to their acceptance by the mlecchas and such other low classes."[9] Aniruddha quotes a

[1] S.P.S., v. 47.

[2] S.P.S., Vṛtti, v. 45. The sphoṭavāda is refuted in v. 57, and sound, on account of its character as effect, is said to be non-eternal (v. 58).

[3] S.P.S., v. 48.

[4] Atīndriyeṣv api padārthatā'vacchedakena sāmānyarūpeṇa pratīter vakṣyamāṇatvād (S.P.B., v. 42).

[5] S.P.B., v. 43.

[6] S.P.S., v. 51.

[7] S.P.S., iii. 81.

[8] S.P.B., i. 98., iv. 51.

[9] *Tattvakaumudī*, 5.

verse in his *Vṛtti* to the effect: "Huge giants do not drop from heaven simply because an āpta, or competent person, says so. Only sayings which are supported by reason should be accepted by me and others like yourselves."[1]

The Sāṁkhya avoids the appearance of being an innovation by its acceptance of the Veda as a means of knowledge. But, as we shall see, it discards many an old dogma and silently ignores others. It, however, never openly opposes the Vedas, but adopts the more deadly process of sapping their foundations.

The modification of buddhi is the pramāṇa, and the validity or the invalidity of these modifications can be tested by the later modifications, and not by any reference to external objects. The object of illusory cognition is not a non-existent object, but an existent one. Water is the object of the illusion of water, and when this illusory cognition is contradicted by the cognition of the rays of the sun, the latter cognition has for its object the rays of the sun.[2] Validity, as well as invalidity, belongs to the cognition itself.[3] Sometimes it is said that only the śruti is of self-evident validity (svataḥpramāṇam), while perception and inference are liable to error and require confirmation.[4] The test of reality is workability (arthakriyākāritva). Our apprehension, moreover, is relative to our ahaṁkāra, or individual purpose. It is difficult to have a disinterested knowledge of the world independent of us. The jīva is imprisoned in its own isolated consciousness, and cannot attain to the knowledge of reality beyond it. It follows that all empirical knowledge is vitiated by a central flaw. Every cognition implicating the puruṣa confuses it with the internal organ. It is when the shadow of buddhi falls on puruṣa that the latter appears as though possessed of cognition.[5]

[1] Na hy āptavacanān nabhaso nipatanti mahāsurāḥ
Yuktimad vacanam grāhyam mayānyaiśca bhavadvidhaiḥ.
(i. 26.)

[2] Prabhācandra criticises this view on the ground that it abolishes the distinction between valid and invalid cognitions.

[3] The Naiyāyika criticises this view on the ground that if cognitions were inherently invalid, we cannot act; and if they were inherently valid we cannot account for erroneous cognitions which are facts.

[4] S.P.S., i. 147; also i. 36, 77, 83, 154; ii. 20, 22; iii. 15, 80; iv. 22.

[5] *Tattvakaumudī*, 5.

XV

Some Critical Considerations on the Sāṁkhya Theory of Knowledge

Postponing to a later section a critical estimate of the Sāṁkhya metaphysics, we may briefly notice here some of the striking defects of the Sāṁkhya theory of knowledge.[1] From the fact that in the world of experience the individual deals with a datum or something given, the Sāṁkhya argues to the independent existence of subjects and objects. As we have seen, in the discussion of the Nyāya theory of knowledge, pure subjects and pure objects are false abstractions which have no meaning apart from the concrete experience in which they function. When the Sāṁkhya breaks up the concrete unity of experience into the two elements of subject and object and makes them fictitiously absolute, it cannot account for the fact of experience. When puruṣa is viewed as pure consciousness, the permanent light which illuminates all objects of knowledge, and prakṛti as something opposed to consciousness and utterly foreign to it, the latter can never become the object of the former. The Sāṁkhya cannot get across the ditch which it has dug between the subject and the object. The metaphors of proximity, reflection, and the like, are artificial remedies intended to cure imaginary diseases. Puruṣa can never know prakṛti, if the two are what the Sāṁkhya takes them to be. The puruṣa cannot say in what way the changes in its consciousness, said to be the reflections of the modifications of buddhi, are brought about. The Sāṁkhya says, when buddhi is modified, this modification is reflected in the consciousness of puruṣa. Granting for argument's sake the validity of this theory of reflection, are we not in the grip of psychological subjectivism? To receive a reflection is not the same thing as to perceive a reality that

[1] There is some similarity between the Sāṁkhya and the Kantian theories of knowledge. The phenomenal world is constituted in both by the co-operation of the transcendental subjects (puruṣas) and objects (prakṛti). Both assert the autonomy of the selves in the trans-empirical world and admit the existence of matter in view of the passivity of the subjects which cannot produce their own sensations. Both hold that the existence of God cannot be proved. In other respects there are vital differences.

is not merely mental. What is the relation between the external object and the internal idea? If the two things are related causally, what becomes of the radical opposition between the two? Is perception at any time a mere change of consciousness? Is it not always an awareness of an object? Are we not going beyond the verified experience when we regard the awareness and the object as two distinct realities? If the puruṣa and the prakṛti are absolutely unrelated to each other, then we cannot account for a conscious occurrence or even a material process. This is evidently a *reductio ad absurdum*. But the Sāṁkhya hides from itself the unsatisfactoriness of its position by a number of metaphors and inconsistencies. When subject and object approach one another, there is said to be a mutual reflection of qualities and transfer of properties. Unless the subject and the object are akin to each other, how can the one reflect the other? How can buddhi, which is non-intelligent, reflect puruṣa? How can the formless puruṣa which is the constant seer be reflected in buddhi which is changing? The two cannot, therefore, be absolutely opposed in nature. The last sūtra of the Vibhūtipāda of the *Yoga Sūtra* states that when buddhi becomes as pure as puruṣa, freedom is attained.[1] A purified buddhi does not bind the puruṣa; and, before the abolition of buddhi, we have the reflection of puruṣa in the purified buddhi. Buddhi makes possible complete knowledge of puruṣa and prakṛti and their distinction. So long as buddhi is tinged with selfish aims and particular purposes the truth cannot be known by us.

The Sāṁkhya theory does not account for the fact of knowledge which is a subject-object relation. It admits that the object depends on the subject to be known, and the subject requires an object to know. In other words, there is no knowledge without the synthesis of the two. The subject cannot know itself fully until it knows the object fully. It cannot know the object until the latter is manifested by the subject. Is not the relation between the two essential? The two cannot be external to each other. The appearance of externality arises on account of our going beyond the fact of experience to account for it.

[1] Sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyam.

The principle of consciousness is never perceived in itself. It is inferred from knowledge. It is said to be pure awareness. The universal element of knowledge is abstracted and set down as the puruṣa or the consciousness which has no form, no quality, no movement. It is called the pure subject. The contents of consciousness which are ever fluctuating are traced to the object world, which is regarded as a fundamental unity whose character is variableness. All objects are material, including sense-data and mental states which are limited in their nature. They come and go and are copies of outer things, though made of subtler stuff. Though the modifications of buddhi belong to the same group as the things of the world, the puruṣa illuminates the former, since buddhi is of a far subtler nature and possesses the quality of sattva in a preponderant degree. Buddhi is better adapted for the reflection of the light of puruṣa than the other products of prakṛti.[1] So far as knowledge is concerned, we get to know other things through the modifications of buddhi or mind-stuff. Each act of knowledge is broken up into the principle of consciousness, which illumines it, and a modification of buddhi which is in itself non-conscious, though it becomes a content of consciousness the moment it is illumined by the puruṣa. The movements of buddhi are in themselves unconscious, but through their connection with puruṣa they are interpreted as the coherent experiences of an individual. Since experience has in it two elements, one constant and the other variable, we cannot isolate the two and argue that the two exist separately and happen to come together in experience. To assume that the subject and the object of knowledge are complete in themselves is to rend the seamless garment of truth by setting up its different elements against the whole to which they essentially belong. If puruṣa is self and prakṛti selfless, then they are, by definition, reciprocally

[1] In gross matter, mass and energy answering to tamas and rajas are the dominant features. In buddhi, tamas is at its lowest and sattva at its highest, and so it has the power of translucence. If buddhi had only sattva and rajas elements, it would give rise to a simultaneous revelation of all objects. It does not do so because of the element of tamas in it. The light of consciousness is reflected wherever tamas is removed. In a sense buddhi hides within it all knowledge potentially. What becomes actual depends on the lifting of the veil of darkness.

exclusive, and there can be no communion between them; and rightly the Sāṁkhya views the relation between the two as a mechanical one. A mechanical relation implies that the subject and the object of consciousness are not only numerically different, but are also, *per se*, wholly independent of and separate from each other. The mechanical modifications of buddhi become illuminated, as if by magic, with the light of consciousness. We have not here any explanation of conscious knowledge.[1] The rise of consciousness on the occasion of a mechanical modification is a baffling mystery. But the problem is of our own creation. We first of all assume the existence of a pure subject and a pure object, which lie wholly without the range of experience, and then struggle to bring them together into experience. A truer philosophy tells us that subject and object are distinguished within consciousness or knowledge, and not simply outside of it. Subject and object do not happen to come together, but are really inseparable from each other. If experience is allowed to speak for itself, it will tell us that subject and object are presented as one. Knowledge becomes intelligible when we recognise that the fundamental relation in all conscious experience is a relation of members which are in an organic unity, which exist as terms in a living process, in and through each other, or in and through a universal which transcends them both, though it does not exclude them. The fundamental fact of a universal consciousness is the presupposition of all knowledge. The Sāṁkhya puruṣa should be really this one universal self, though it is regarded as many on account of the confusion between the psychological and the metaphysical self. Of course, every jīva has the universal self operating in it. In one sense, our knowledge is the manifestation of a universal principle; while, from another point of view, it is dependent on a sensible process, which must be stimulated from without by its appropriate objects. Intelligence is the same in all in whom it is

[1] Cp. "That the non-intelligent ahaṁkāra should manifest the self-luminous self has no more sense than to say that a spent coal manifests the sun."

Śāntāṅgāra ivādityam ahaṁkāro jaḍātmakaḥ
Svayaṁjyotiṣam ātmānaṁ vyanaktīti na yuktimad.

Yāmunācārya: *Ātmasiddhi*, quoted in R.B., ii. 1. 1).

developed, and is everywhere struggling to free itself from individual limitations and regards things, not from the point of view of a particular organism, but from that of a pure subject. While in one sense our knowledge is our own, in another it is independent of us who possess it.

XVI

Ethics

The Sāṁkhya starts with the idea of the universality of suffering,[1] which is of three kinds: ādhyātmika, *i.e.* arising from the psychophysical nature of man; ādhibhautika, *i.e.* arising from the external world; and the ādhidaivika, *i.e.* arising from the supernatural agencies. The pain caused by the disorders of the body or mental unrest is of the first kind; the second type is due to men, beasts and birds; while the third owes its existence to the influence of planets and the elemental agencies.[2] Every individual strives to alleviate and if possible get rid of pain. But pain cannot be rooted out by the remedies prescribed by the science of medicine or the scriptures.[3] Liberation is not attainable by the observance of Vedic rites. Like Buddhism and Jainism, the Sāṁkhya urges that the Vedic rites involve a violation of the great moral principles. The law of ahiṁsā is set aside when we kill an animal for the Agniṣṭoma sacrifice. Killing is productive of sin, even though it be in a sacrifice. Besides, the kind of heaven we get to by the performance of the sacrifice is a temporary one. Life in heaven (svarga) is not exempt from the influence of the three guṇas. By the practice of virtue and the performance of sacrifices we simply postpone the evil but do not get rid of it. We cannot escape from evils by death, since the same fate pursues us life after life. If the miseries are natural to the soul, there is no help for us; if they are only accidental and arise from something else, we can escape suffering by separating ourselves from the source of suffering.

Bondage belongs to prakṛti and is attributed to puruṣa.

[1] S.P.S., vi. 6–8; Y.S., ii. 15.
[2] *Tattvakaumudī*, 1.
[3] S.K., 2.

"Although bondage in the form of the cognition of pain, and discrimination and non-discrimination in the form of functions belong to the citta or the inner organ, still puruṣa's enjoyment or suffering consists in the mere reflection of pain in him."[1] Puruṣa's bondage is a fiction,[2] due to its proximity to citta. It is therefore said to be adventitious (aupādhika). If puruṣa's connection with pain were real, it could not be cut off. Vijñānabhikṣu quotes a verse from the *Kūrma Purāṇa*[3] to the effect: "Were the self by nature impure, unclean, mutable, verily release would not be possible for it even by hundreds of rebirths."[4] Bondage is not due to time or space, embodiment or karma.[5] All these belong to the not-self. The property of one thing cannot produce change in another, for then all would enjoy pleasure or suffer pain.[6] Bondage arises through the conjunction of prakṛti with puruṣa, which is by nature eternal and pure, enlightened and unconfined.[7] Nor is the mere presence of prakṛti the cause of experience, since on such a view the released soul might have experience; but its cause is "the object of experience, which does not exist in the state of release."[8] Non-discrimination (aviveka) is the cause of bondage (bandha-hetu). This aviveka belongs to buddhi, though it has the puruṣa for its object. It follows that our misery will terminate only when our aviveka ends. Knowledge and ignorance are the sole determinants of release and bondage.[9]

Puruṣa is eternally free. It does not desire or hate, govern or obey, impel or restrain. The moral life is vested in the subtle body which accompanies the puruṣa from birth to birth; pain is the essence of bodily existence.[10] When the

[1] S.P.B., i. 58.
[2] Vāṅmātram. S.P.S., Vṛtti, i. 58.
[3] ii. 2. 12.
[4] Yady ātmā malino 'svaccho vikārī syāt svabhāvataḥ
Na hi tasya bhaven muktir janmāntaraśatair api. (S.P.B., i. 7.)

Were pain natural to puruṣa, there would be no point in the injunction to get rid of it (S.P.S., i. 8–11).

[5] S.P.S., i. 12–16.
[6] S.P.S., Vṛtti, i. 17.
[7] i. 19.
[8] S.P.S., Vṛtti, vi. 44.
[9] S.P.S., ii. 7. Aniruddha quotes a verse in his S.P.S., Vṛtti, to the effect: "There is no bondage in the nature of things (vastusthityā), nor does release follow from its non-existence. Both these constituted by error have no real existence" (i. 7).
[10] S.K., 55.

soul is left alone, it is said to be purified. The supreme good, which the jīva aims at and strives for, is to realise the perfection of the puruṣa. All ethical activity is for the fuller realisation of the puruṣa in us. The circuit of saṁsāra is one of conflict and change, made up of parts that are indifferent and external to each other. The jīva, in its endless revolutions, is ever seeking and ever failing to attain to unity with itself, *i.e.* attain to the status of puruṣa, which is eternally one with itself and complete in itself, having no necessary relation with anything external to it. Every jīva has in it the higher puruṣa, and to realise its true nature has no need to go out of itself, but only to become conscious of its real nature. The ethical process is not the development of something new, but a re-discovery of what we have forgotten. Release is a return into one's true self and deliverance from a yoke to which the jīva has subjected itself. It is the removal of an illusion which hides our true nature from our eyes. The knowledge that " I am not " (nāsmi), that " naught is mine " (na me), and that " the ego exists not " (nāham), leads to release.[1]

While freedom is brought about by knowledge, this knowledge is not merely theoretical. It is what results from the practice of virtue, yoga, etc.[2] While bondage is traced to wrong knowledge (viparyaya), this wrong knowledge includes not only avidyā, or unreal cognition, but also asmitā, or egoism, rāga or desire, dveṣa or hatred, and abhiniveśa or fear.[3] These are brought about by aśakti, or incapacity, which is of twenty-eight kinds, of which eleven belong to the senses and seventeen to buddhi.[4] Unselfish activity is an indirect means to salvation.[5] By itself it does not lead us to freedom. It may yield birth in the divine regions, which is not to be confused with mokṣa.[6] Vairāgya, which follows the rise of discriminative knowledge, is different from that which precedes it.[7] Through vairāgya, or unattachment, absorption into prakṛti takes place.[8] This dissolution into prakṛti is not

[1] S.K., 64.
[2] S.P.B., iii. 77 and 78.
[3] S.P.S. and S.P.B., iii. 37.
[4] S.P.S., iii. 38; S.K., 49.
[5] i. 82, 85.
[6] S.P.S., iii. 52–53.
[7] Four kinds of vairāgya are distinguished in *Tattvakaumudī*, 23.
[8] Vairāgyāt prakṛtilayaḥ (S.K., 45; S.P.S., iii. 54).

ultimate freedom; for the souls thus absorbed in prakṛti reappear as Īśvaras, or Lords, since their error is not consumed by knowledge. " He who in a previous creation was absorbed into the cause (prakṛti) becomes in another creation the ādipuruṣa, having the character of Īśvara, or Lord, all-knowing and all-doing." [1] Ethical virtues help us to realise the deeper consciousness, while vices involve a darkening of this consciousness. By indulging in vices the soul immerses itself more and more completely in the material body.

The method of yoga occupies a prominent place in the *Sāṁkhya Sūtra*, though not in the *Kārikā*. We can obtain discriminative knowledge only when our emotional stirrings are subdued and intellectual activities are controlled. When the senses are regulated and the mind acquires calm, buddhi becomes transparent, and reflects the pure light of puruṣa. While buddhi is in its intrinsic nature sāttvika, on account of its acquired impulses and tendencies (vāsanās), it has lapsed from its innate purity. By dhyāna (meditation), the taints of citta caused by the external objects are removed.[2] When the citta regains its pristine condition and rids itself of its desires, the objects no longer excite love or hatred. We have to gain spiritual calm and composure, when the objects do not excite our egoistic interests but reveal their true nature. Since this absolute detachment is beyond the reach of ordinary men, they attempt to develop the impersonal outlook by resorting to art. Works of art offer a temporary release from the natural world.

The doctrine of the guṇas [3] has great ethical significance. The beings of the world are classified according to the preponderance of the different guṇas in them. In the devas the sattva element predominates, while the rajas and the tamas are reduced. In man the tamas element is reduced to

[1] S.P.B., iii. 56. Different kinds of bondage are distinguished by Vācaspati as natural (prākṛtika), incidental (vaikṛtika), and personal (dākṣiṇaka). While the first look upon prakṛti as the absolute spirit, the second look upon the products of prakṛti as the absolute spirit. The third neglect the true nature of spirit in wordly activities indulged in for the gaining of personal ends (iṣṭāpūrta) (*Tattvakaumudī*, 44; *Tattvasamāsa*, p. 19).

[2] S.P.S., iii. 30; S.P.B., iii. 30.

[3] While in the Sāṁkhya the guṇas are purely non-intelligent, in the Vedānta they reflect the character of intelligence.

a less extent than in the devas. In the animal world the sattva is reduced considerably. In the vegetable kingdom tamas is more predominant than in the others. The upward ascent consists in the gradual increase of the sattva element and diminution of the tamas, since pain is a particular modification of the quality of rajas.[1] Strictly speaking, the guṇas mingle, combine and strive in every fibre of our being. Their relative strength determines our mental character. We have men of elevated spirituality, passionate force and depressing apathy. Tamas, if predominant, brings in inertia, ignorance, weakness, incapacity, want of faith and disinclination to act. It produces the coarse, dull, ignorant type of human nature. The individuals in whom the rajas is predominant are intrepid, restless and active. Sattva develops the critical, balanced, thoughtful nature. While the three guṇas are present in different proportions in all men, the seer, the saint and the sage have sattva highly developed in them; the warrior, the statesman and the forceful man of action have rajas highly developed in them. Again, though the guṇas affect every part of our natural being, relatively speaking, the three guṇas have their strongest hold in the three different members of it, namely, mind, life and body. The Sāṁkhya recognises no merit in sacrifices. It does not exclude the śūdras from higher studies. The teacher is not necessarily a Brahmin, but he who has freed himself. The winning of a good teacher depends on our previous conduct.

XVII

Release

Salvation in the Sāṁkhya system is only phenomenal, since bondage does not belong to puruṣa. Bondage and release refer to the conjunction and the disjunction of puruṣa and prakṛti resulting from non-discrimination and discrimination.[2] Prakṛti does not bind the puruṣa but itself in various shapes.[3] Puruṣa is entirely free from the oppositions of merit and demerit.[4] While bondage is the activity of prakṛti

[1] Duḥkhaṁ rajaḥpariṇāmaviśeṣaḥ.
[2] S.P.S., iii. 72.
[3] S.K., 62.
[4] S.P.S., iii. 64; Y.S., ii. 22.

towards one not possessing discrimination, release is its inactivity towards one possessing discrimination.[1] When prakṛti is active, it catches the reflection of puruṣa and casts its shadow on the puruṣa. Yet the change appearing in puruṣa is unreal and fictitious.[2] The union of puruṣa with the subtle body is the cause of saṁsāra, and salvation is attained through the breaking of the union by means of the knowledge of the distinction between puruṣa and prakṛti. When prakṛti withdraws itself from puruṣa, the latter realises the absurdity of attributing the adventures of prakṛti to itself. Puruṣa remains in eternal isolation and prakṛti relapses into inactivity. So long as there are objects concealing the real natue of the soul, liberation cannot be attained. When prakṛti ceases to act, the modifications of buddhi cease, and the puruṣa assumes its natural form.[3] "The cessation of the creation by the pradhāna in regard to the released one is nothing but this, *viz.* the non-production of the cause of the experience thereof, *i.e.* the particular transformation of one's own upādhi called birth."[4] When freed, the puruṣa keeps no company, looks to nothing without itself, and entertains no alien thoughts.[5] It is no longer at the mercy of prakṛti or its products, but stands as a star apart, undisturbed by the earthly cares. There is in reality no distinction between the bound and the released, for freedom consists in the removal of obstacles which hinder the full manifestation of the glory of puruṣa.[6] In samādhi or ecstatic consciousness, suṣupti or dreamless sleep and release, the puruṣa rests in its own form of Brahman (brahmarūpatā) through the dissolution of the modifications of buddhi.[7] In dreamless sleep and ecstatic consciousness the traces of past experiences are present, while they are absent in release.[8] The discriminative knowledge itself disappears when release is attained, for it is like a medicine which purges itself out as well as the disease. While deliverance is an escape from suffering, it is not an escape from all existence. The Sāṁkhya has firm faith in

[1] S.K., 61. [2] S.P.S., ii., 8. Cp. also S.P.B., i. 164. [3] S.P.S., ii. 34; Y.S., ii. 3.

[4] Muktam prati pradhānasṛṣṭyuparamo yat tadbhogahetoḥ svopādhi pariṇāmaviśeṣasya janmākhyasyānutpādanam (S.P.B., vi. 44).

[5] Prakṛtiviyogo mokṣaḥ: Haribhadra.

[6] S.P.S., vi. 20. [7] Y.S., i. 4. [8] S.P.S., v. 117.

the continuance of puruṣa, and so cannot be regarded as pessimistic. When the play of prakṛti ceases, its developments will lapse into the undeveloped. The puruṣas will be seers with nothing to look at, mirrors with nothing to reflect, and will subsist in lasting freedom from prakṛti and its defilements as pure intelligences in the timeless void. On release, "the puruṣa, unmoved and self-collected, as a spectator contemplates prakṛti which has ceased to produce."[1] The Sāṁkhya ideal of freedom is not to be confused with the Buddhist goal of voidness or extinction of self,[2] or the Advaita absorption into Brahman,[3] or the Yogic acquisition of supernatural powers.[4] Nor is mukti the manifestation of bliss (ānanda), since puruṣa is free from all attributes.[5] The scriptural passages which speak of bliss mean to convey that the state of release is one of freedom from pain.[6] So long as the puruṣa has attributes, it is not free.[7]

When discrimination arises, prakṛti does not forthwith free the puruṣa, for, on account of the momentum of past habits, its work continues for some little time[8]; only the body is no more an obstacle to it. By virtue of the force of prārabdhakarma, the body continues, though no fresh karma is accumulated. Though the jīvanmukta has no aviveka, yet his past saṁskāras compel him to possess a body.[9] Release from bondage and continuance of body are compatible with each other, since they are determined by different causes. At death the jīvanmukta attains complete liberation, or disembodied isolation (videhakaivalya).[10] The jīvanmuktas teach us about the nature of freedom and the means of attaining it.[11]

If the play of prakṛti ceases, the puruṣa is no more the spectator, since there is nothing to see; yet it is said that the freed soul has knowledge of the whole universe.[12] We do not know whether the released souls hold social intercourse among themselves. The goal seems to be an extinction of individuality, and not an enhancement of personality. The

[1] See also S.K., 65. [2] S.P.S., v. 77–79. [3] S.P.S., v. 81.
[4] S.P.S., v. 82. [5] v. 74. [6] v. 67.
[7] The Sāṁkhya view of freedom is not unlike Aristotle's view of blessedness as eternal thinking free from all activity.
[8] S.K., 67. [9] S.P.S., iii. 82–83.
[10] Chān. Up., viii. 12. 1. [11] iii. 79.
[12] S.P.S., Vṛtti, vi. 59.

highest state of isolation from prakṛti and other souls is one of passivity, which no breath of emotion or stir of action disturbs. It is likely to be confused with a state of unconscious existence. Praśastapāda objects to the Sāṁkhya theory of freedom, on the ground that prakṛti, which is by its very nature active, cannot rest idle. If prakṛti is unintelligent, how can it know whether the puruṣa has perceived the truth or not ?[1] If, according to the Sāṁkhya, there is only disappearance and not destruction of things, there is no possibility of a complete destruction of ignorance, passion, etc. ; in other words, there is every chance that they may burst out again in the released soul.[2]

XVIII

Future Life

The Sāṁkhya guarantees the endless existence of the soul in both directions. If the soul does not exist from all eternity, then there is no reason why it should exist to all eternity. The soul is not, therefore, created. The more we recognise the eternity of souls the less need do we find for a creator God.[3] According to the Sāṁkhya, the failure to discriminate between puruṣa and prakṛti is the cause of saṁsāra. This non-discrimination leaves an impression on the internal organ which produces in the next birth the same fatal defect. The liṅgadeha, or subtle body, which migrates from one gross body to another in successive births, is composed of buddhi, ahaṁkāra and manas, the five organs of perception and the five of action, the five tanmātras as well as the rudiments of the gross elements, which serve as the seed whence the physical body grows. These subtle portions of the gross

[1] ' In fact, we find that even when it has duly brought about a certain perception of sound, for instance, it still goes on functioning towards the same perception ; and in the same way, even after it will have brought about discriminative knowledge, it would go on with its functioning towards the same end, as its active nature will not have been set aside (by the said knowledge) " (P.P., p. 7).

[2] Udayana's *Pariśuddhi*, ii. 2. 13 ; *Śāstradīpikā*, pp. 3 3 ff.

[3] Some thinkers like McTaggart argue for a non-omnipotent and non-creative God.

elements are as necessary to the psychic apparatus as the canvas to a picture.[1] This subtle body, incorporeal in character, receives the impressions made by deeds performed in the course of its various migrations. The form of the new embodiment is determined by it. It is the real seat of pleasure and pain.[2] The liṅga, though distinct from puruṣa, constitutes the character and essential being of the person. In it are contained the saṁskāras or predispositions. The liṅga is compared to an actor who plays various parts. It has this power, because it shares in the property of all-pervadingness which belongs to prakṛti. The conjunction of puruṣa with the liṅga is the cause, as well as the symptom, of misery, and persists until the attainment of true insight. While the subtle bodies are continuant, those produced from father and mother perish at death.[3] The union of the liṅga with the gross body constitutes birth, and its separation from it death. Except in the case of those who have attained freedom, the existence and rebirth of liṅga last for a whole world-period, at the end of which come quiescence and equilibrium. But, when creation is renewed, it starts out again on its career.

The investiture in successive frames is determined by the dispositions (bhāvas), which are the results of acts which are impossible without bodies subtle and gross.[4] This mutual dependence, like that of seed and sprout, is beginningless, and need not be regarded as a defect.[5] The evolution of buddhi,

[1] S.K., 41. We cannot therefore say that mere buddhi, ahaṁkāra, manas will do, since these require the support of a subtle body. Some construe this passage as demanding the existence of a gross body, but this interpretation is not satisfactory in view of the obvious fact that during the transition from one life to another the subtle body subsists without the gross. Vijñānabhikṣu suggests that there is a third kind of body called adhiṣṭhānaśarīra formed of a finer form of the gross elements and serving as the receptacle of the subtle body (S.P.B., iii. 12).

[2] S.P.S., iii. 8.

[3] S.K., 39.

[4] S.K., 52. While Vācaspati and Nārāyaṇa interpret the relation of liṅga and bhāva as one of experiencing and the objects experienced, Vijñānabhikṣu takes it to refer to the relation of intellect and its conditions

[5] Thus there are three kinds of creation: corporeal creation (bhautikasarga), consisting of souls with gross bodies, comprising eight orders of superior beings and five of inferior, which, together with the human kind, which forms a class apart, constitute the fourteen orders of being distributed in the three worlds, the creation of the subtle bodies (tanmātrasarga), and

such as creatorship and rulership of the universe.[1] There are thus two views of the ultimate, higher and lower. "Where, by discarding the differences of name, form, and the like, ascribed by avidyā, Brahman is indicated by negative expressions, as not gross, etc.,[2] it is the higher (param). But where, on the contrary, exactly the same reality is described, for purposes of worship, as distinguished by some difference or other, it is the lower (aparam)."[3] Brahman cast through the moulds of logic is Īśvara. It is not the highest reality, since it has no meaning for the highest experience where existence and content are no longer separated. Yet it is the best image of the truth possible under our present conditions of knowledge. The saguṇa Brahman is not the mere self-projection of the yearning spirit or a floating air-bubble. The gleaming ideal is the way in which the everlasting real appears to our human mind.[4] A demand for theoretic con-

[1] Cp. *Ratnaprabhā*: "Vidyāviṣayo jñeyaṁ nirguṇaṁ satyam avidyāviṣaya upāsyaṁ saguṇaṁ kalpitam" (i. 1. 11). Cp. with this the analogical knowledge of Schoolmen, the knowledge that knows its deficiency and by the very acknowledgment of it corrects it. Cp. Plotinus: "If we call it the Good, we do not intend any formal affirmation of a quality within itself; we mean only that it is the Goal or Term to which all aspire. When we affirm existence of it, we mean no more than that it does not fall within the realm of non-existents; it transcends even the quality of being" (McKenna's E.T., vol. i, p. 118).

[2] Bṛh., iii. 8. 8.

[3] S.B., i. 31; iv. 3. 14.

[4] D.S.V., p. 103. Cp. Eckhart, who draws a distinction between Godhead who is incomprehensible and God who works and creates. "In himself he is not God, in the creature only doth he become God. I ask to be rid of God, *i.e.* that God by his grace would bring me into the essence; that essence which is above God and above distinction. I would enter into that eternal unity which was mine before all time, and when I was what I would and would what I was; into that state which is above all addition or diminution, into the immobility whereby all is moved" (quoted in Hunt's *Essay on Pantheism*, p. 179). Plotinus says: "We form a conception of its Authentic Being from its image playing upon the Intellectual Principle. This image of itself it has communicated to the Intellect that contemplates it; thus all the striving is on the side of the Intellect, which is the eternal striver and eternally the attainer. The Being beyond neither strives, since it feels no lack, nor attain, since it has no striving" (*Enneads*: McKenna's E.T., vol. ii, p. 135). Cp. Bradley: "Fully to realise the existence of the Absolute is for finite beings impossible. . . But to gain an idea of its main features—an idea true so far as it goes, though abstract and incomplete—is a different endeavour. . . . And surely no more than this is wanted for a knowledge of the Absolute. It is a knowledge which of course differs enormously from the fact. But it is true for all that, while it respects its own limits; and it seems fully attainable by the finite intellect" (*Appearance and Reality*, p. 159).

sistency requires us to describe the Absolute by a set of negations, "neither personal nor moral, nor beautiful nor true," as Bradley does. The inevitable effect of the negative account is to make us believe that the Absolute has nothing to do with or is indifferent to the higher aspects of experience. When these negative formulas of an exact metaphysics defeat their object, we are inclined, in the interests of our religious needs, to lay a different emphasis.[1]

But Brahman cannot be both determinate (saguṇa) and indeterminate (nirguṇa).[2] A reality that has two sides or can be experienced in two ways is not the highest reality. The sides are dissolved the moment we touch the fountain of being. We catch aspects of the Absolute when we look at it from outside. In itself the Absolute is without sides, without forms, and without any element of duality or guṇas. These characters of form and personality have meaning in the world of vidyā, or experience. In the supreme Brahman there is a natural dissolution of all relativities. It is not a system or a whole which can be achieved by an endless process of reconciling opposites.[3] The infinite is not an object constructed by philosophy; it is an ever-present fact. Śaṁkara is opposed to all attempts to think the Absolute. The moment we think it, it becomes a part of the world of experience.[4]

[1] Cp. Bradley: *Truth and Reality*, p. 431.

[2] "One and the same thing cannot in itself be affected by differences such as form, etc., and not be affected by them, for this is a contradiction. . . . And by being connected with limitations a thing of one kind cannot assume another nature; for when rock crystal is transparent it does not become opaque by being connected with limitations such as red colour and the like; on the contrary, it is a misconception (bhrama) that opaqueness permeates it. . . . Whatever character is assumed, Brahman must be regarded as unchangeably free from all differences and not the reverse" (D.S.V., pp. 102–3).

[3] While strict logic requires Bradley to adopt a similar position, he yet wavers and has certain ultimate doubts. Strictly speaking, the Absolute excludes all positive and negative features, and we cannot reach it through logic, for we cannot go out of the relative by the relative. Our logical understanding, proceeding from limit to limit, cannot arrive at the unlimited. When we transcend our finiteness, we have nothing else than an absolute in which all that is formal and finite is dissolved.

[4] Ramānuja holds that the divine is the human view enlarged. The difference between the human understanding and the divine is one of range and not character; while the human view takes in some relations, the divine takes in all of them. But Śaṁkara is of a different opinion. If we are lost in the world of relatives, it is not possible to exhaust the relative.

XXVII

Īśvara or Personal God

Īśvara, according to Śaṁkara, is the determinate (saguṇa) Brahman regarded as the supreme personality. Śaṁkara believes that the question of God's existence is an absurd one. If God exists, then he must exist as other objects do, which would be to reduce God to the level of the finite, making him simply a unit in the indefinite multiplicity of objects, distinct from them all, even as they are distinct from each other, or merging him in the totality of existence in a pantheism which will be practically indistinguishable from atheism. To state the question of God in terms of existence removes in advance all possibility of solving it. If the rigidity of reason is any security for the attainment of truth, we should have arrived at it long ago. As a matter of fact we find different schools, each pretending to be logical, in conflict with the rest. Śaṁkara takes up the so-called proofs for the existence of God, the epistemological, the cosmological and the physico-theological, and shows their futility, as Kant did at a much later day.

The ideal of logic compels us to assume the reality of a perfect subject, to whom all existence is related as an object. Truth as systematic harmony means the reality of a divine experience. That events are interconnected in a system is the assumption of common sense and science, which is increasingly confirmed by experience, though never realised in its entirety. For there is much in the world which never directly enters into our experience. We seem to know much, though even in this limited region our knowledge is imperfect. Only a complete apprehension of reality as a whole can justify the hypothesis that God is and he is the creator of all. Our human experience is incapable of apprehending the world in its entirety, achieve a harmony of pure being with restless

When the terms are capable of endless subdivisions, and when their relations are capable of infinite permutations, a whole view of terms and relations is impossible. The putting together of the appearances does not lead us to truth. The real is beyond appearances and truth is beyond thought.

infinitude.[1] However much we might simplify and order our experience and reduce its complexity to the single prakṛti, the puruṣa, or the subject, would still remain the outside observer of its lonely flight through space and history. If the universe is small enough for our little minds to explore, if we can tell whence it comes and whither it goes, can understand its origin, nature and destiny, then we are not finite and we do not demand an infinite. The logical belief that all facts belong to a system and express the mind of God is only an idea.

The cosmological argument employs the concept of cause, which is not adequate even in the empirical world, and turns out altogether useless when we try to relate the world of experience to the ultimate reality, which is said to manifest itself through it. The different lines in the phenomenal series cannot explain one another. We cannot admit within the world of phenomena an uncaused cause. The question of an absolute beginning of the phenomenal series, saṁsāra, is a self-contradictory one. To seek for it is to seek in time for that which is the condition of the very being of time. It is the essence of saṁsāra that it has no beginning. The infinite to which we rise by the mere negation of the finite is another idea requiring explanation. When the argument from causality, which has its validity confined to the world of changing phenomena, is applied to the real, the latter is misconceived, since it is made an object of knowledge, and that which we infer as the cause of the world belongs also to the world of experience. We can infer only a finite creator from a finite world, even if we assume the universality of the principle that every effect has a cause.[2] The first cause must be a unity of the same order of being as the objects of experience, since the latter are brought into relation with it. If Īśvara is the cause of the world, he must be within the space-time framework, a vastly magnified man whose self-consciousness is defined by the instrumentality of a body and a mind analogous to our own. If such a being exists, no foreseeable extension of our knowledge could enable us to

[1] Cp. "For God alone sits high enough above
To speculate so largely."

[2] Yat kāryaṁ tat sakartṛkam.

determine his nature and existence. Such a God, moreover, working through instruments analogous to the human ones, is neither infinite nor omnipotent.

The moral argument that the context of things is adapted to the soul of man and shows the workmanship of a benevolent God is quite unsatisfactory. However the matter be turned, in a real world the responsibility for sin and evil falls on God.[1] If, to relieve him of the authorship of evil, we accept something like the mythology of Persia and make Satan responsible for it, then the oneness of God disappears and we reinstate a dualism between God and Satan. Again, if the soul is a part of God, God must feel the pain of the soul also, even as, when one member of the body suffers, the whole body suffers with it. It follows that the sufferings of God are much greater than those of the individual souls, and it is better for us to remain self-enclosed individuals with our limited sufferings than rise to the level of God and take upon ourselves the burden of the whole world.

A perfect God does not require the world for his satisfaction. If it is said that the world is for his enjoyment, then God is no God but only a saṁsārin. If we say that God has determinations, guṇas, like personality, perfection, etc., it is difficult to conceive how these can coexist with absoluteness. The attempt to conserve the characters of personality (guṇa) and absoluteness (Brahman) seems to be wellnigh impossible for logic.

The lesson which Śaṁkara derives from these inadequate proofs for the existence of God is that the question has no meaning in reality and arises only within the world of experience. When we realise the relative character of the world, we shall see that the problem of creation and the answer to it both belong to our logical world and not to reality as it is. To set aside the logical proofs is not to deny the existence of Īśvara. Śaṁkara's point is that no purely rational argu-

[1] The solution suggested by the Hebrew prophet, "I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil, I the Lord do all these things," finds an echo in some passages of the Upaniṣads. "For he makes those do good works whom he will guide out from this world, and he makes those do evil whom he will guide downwards; he is the guardian of the world, he is the ruler of the world, he is the lord of the world" (*Kauṣītaki Up.*, iii. 8).

ment for the existence of God as a personal supreme being is finally acceptable. At best the "proofs" only tell us that God is a possibility. The reality of God transcends our rational powers of conceiving as well as comprehending[1]; only if we resort to the spiritual insight of seers as recorded in the scriptures can we be certain of God. The reality of Īśvara, in Śaṁkara's philosophy, is not a self-evident axiom, is not a logical truth, but an empirical postulate which is practically useful. Śruti is the basis for it.[2] Īśvara is the supreme spirit, all-knowing (sarvajña), and possessed of all powers (sarvaśaktisamanvitam). He is the soul of nature, the principle of the universe, its animating breath and actuating spring, the source and end of all existent modes. What is based on scriptural testimony is not necessarily opposed to reason. To accept śruti is to accept belief for which there are no disproofs, though there are not adequate proofs. In the logical account we render to ourselves of the world we reach a point where we require help from another source. Before we rise to intuition, we resort to śruti. Regarding the creatorship of Īśvara, scripture is our only means of knowledge.[3] It declares that "the cause from which (proceeds) the origin, substance and dissolution of the world, which is extended in names and forms, which includes many agents and enjoyers, which contains the fruit of works, specially determined according to space, time and cause, a world which is formed after an arrangement inconceivable even for the mind—this omniscient and omnipotent cause is Brahman (*i.e.* Īśvara)."[4] All the perfections, metaphysical and moral,

[1] Cp. Schweitzer: "If we take the world as it is, it is impossible to explain it in any way which will give meaning to the ends and aims of the activities of men and of humanity. We can discover no trace in the world of any purposive development which might lend significance to our actions" (Preface, xii, *Civilisation and Ethics*, pt. ii).

[2] Though Kant is regarded as the first philosophical thinker in Europe who sought to establish the futility of logical proofs, it must be said in fairness to Plato that he recognised it. "Therefore is it an impossible task to discover the Creator and father of this whole universe and publish the discovery of him in words for all to understand" (*Timæus*, 28, C.). Cp. Bishop Gore: "I acknowledge that human reason could never by its unassisted efforts have arrived at this conception of God the Creator" (*Belief in God*, p. 152), and so he asks us to turn to Revelation. So St. Thomas Aquinas. Cp. S.B. on *Kena Up.*, i. 4.

[3] B.S., i. 1. 3.

[4] S.B., i. 1. 2.

are ascribed to him. He is said to be raised above all evil.[1] He is the immanent spirit (antaryāmin) pervading the object and the subject worlds, seen in the interior of the sun (object) as well as in the interior of the eye (subject).[2] He is the creator, ruler and destroyer of the universe.[3]

Śaṁkara takes great pains to prove that the reality of Īśvara, when once it is ascertained from the scripture, can be reconciled with the demands of reason. We only perceive the effect, so that it cannot be decided whether the world is connected with Īśvara as its cause or with something else, since the same effect can have different causes. So we must accept the statement of the scriptures that Īśvara is the cause of the world. Īśvara is the first cause, since he has no origin (asambhava). Īśvara as pure being (sanmātram) cannot have sprung from pure being, since the relation of cause and effect cannot exist without a certain superiority in the cause.[4] Īśvara cannot have sprung from differentiated being, since experience tells us that differences arise from the non-differenced, and not *vice versa*. He cannot have sprung from non-being, since it is essenceless (nirātmaka). Scripture also rejects this view, for it asks, How can being come out of non-being? Nor can Īśvara be a modification, since this would land us in infinite regress.[5] Īśvara is unproduced, has no cause, and is no effect. If Īśvara were an effect, then every effect from ākāśa downwards would be essenceless and we should embrace nihilism.[6] That which gives reality to all modifications is Īśvara.

Admitting the principle that every effect has a cause, may not the cause be the atoms, or the prakṛti, or non-being, or an individual agent, or spontaneity?[7] Śaṁkara refutes all these possibilities. Nature is not dead, but is alive and animated from within. The scene of nature is well adapted for the drama of the soul-life. "In the world, no non-intelligent object without being guided by an intelligence brings forth from itself the products which serve to further given aims of man. For example, houses, palaces, beds, seats, pleasure-gardens

---

[1] Chān., i. 6; S.B., i. 1. 20.
[2] S.B., i. 1. 20; Bṛh. Up., iii. 7. 9.
[3] See S.B., i. 1. 18–20, 22; i. 3. 39, 41; i. 2. 9–10.
[4] Since nothing superior to Īśvara can be conceived, therefore Īśvara exists uncaused. Cp. with this Descartes's ontological argument.
[5] S.B., ii. 3. 9. [6] S B ii. 3. 7. [7] S.B., i. 1. 2.

and the like are contrived in life by intelligent artists in due time for the purpose of obtaining pleasure and averting pain. It is exactly the same with this whole world. For when one sees how, for example, the earth serves the end of the enjoyment of the fruit of the manifold works, and how, again, the body within and without by possessing a given arrangement of parts suitable to the different species and determined in detail that it may form the place of enjoyment of the fruit of the manifold works . . . how should this arrangement proceed from the non-intelligent pradhāna ? . . . Clay, also, for example, is formed, as experience teaches, to different shapes only so long as it is guided by the potter, and exactly in the same way must matter be guided by another intelligent power." [1] The purpose of creation is to serve as the stage for the reward of the deeds of earlier existences which stretch back for each individual *ad infinitum*. Unconscious prakṛti is not the explanation of nature or the subjective aspect of the world and the working of the law of karma. Consciousness and activity must belong to the cause of the world.[2] The regularity and adaptation (racana) of the world indicate a conscious director. The same is implied by the co-operation of several means for one end.[3] Śaṁkara notices the theory of the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā that not God but apūrva accounts for the ordered way in which men reap the fruits of their deeds. He criticises it on the ground that apūrva is unspiritual and cannot operate unless it is moved by something spiritual. The extra-cosmic God of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika is inadequate, since he is not the material cause of the universe. Were the individual the creator, he would have produced what is beneficial to himself, and not things of a contrary nature such as birth, death, old age, disease, etc. For " we know that no free person will build a prison for himself and take up his abode in it." [4] Chance, atoms, prakṛti and the Nyāya God are larger and more impossible demands than what the scripture makes. So the omniscient, all-powerful, eternal, all-pervading Īśvara is the cause of the world.[5]

Īśvara is said to be the material as well as the efficient cause of the world. To the objection that in experience material causes do not possess knowledge, Śaṁkara answers : " It is not necessary that it should be here the same as in experience ; for this subject is known

[1] S.B., ii. 2. 1.

[2] If the mere presence of Brahman is enough to move the world as a magnet does iron, will not the mere vicinity of puruṣas suffice for the activity of prakṛti ? Again, avidyā naturally tends to creation and is in need of no purpose. " Avidyā ca svabhāvata eva, kāryonmukhī na prayojanam apekṣate " (*Bhāmatī*, ii. 1. 33).

[3] S.B., i. 3. 39.

[4] Na hi kaścid aparatantro bandhanāgāram ātmanaḥ kṛtvā'nupraviśati (ii. 1. 21). Cp. Descartes : " If I were myself the author of my being, I should have bestowed on myself every perfection of which I possess the idea, and I should thus be God " (*Meditations*, p. iii).

[5] See S.B., ii. 1. 22 ; iv. 1. 23 and 24.

by revelation and not inference." When we rely on scriptural statements, it is not necessary for us to conform to experience.[1] An efficient cause, according to the Nyāya philosophy, is that whose knowledge, desire and effort are necessary to bring about the product. The Vedāntin admits only knowledge which is self-sufficient and not desire and effort which assume a prior desire and a prior effort *ad infinitum*. It is argued that Īśvara cannot be the cause of the world since there is a difference of nature (vilakṣaṇatvam) between the cause and the effect. A piece of gold cannot be the cause of a vessel of clay; so Īśvara pure and spiritual cannot be the cause of the world, which is impure and unspiritual.[2] Śaṁkara replies that unconscious objects frequently take their rise from conscious beings, such as hairs and nails from men. From the inanimate dung, the animate dung-beetle comes forth. If it is urged that in these cases, in spite of apparent diversity, there is fundamental identity, since both of these spring from the earth, Śaṁkara replies that Īśvara and the world have the common characteristic of being, or sattā. The two are not totally different, and if Īśvara has a certain superiority (atiśaya), it is not surprising, since the cause everywhere has this feature.[3]

Another objection states that if the world issues from and returns to Īśvara, then, on its return, the qualities of the world such as materiality, compositeness, non-intelligence, limitedness, impurity, etc., must defile Īśvara.[4] Śaṁkara says in reply that when the effects return to their causes, they lose their specific qualities and merge in their cause, as when gold ornaments return to gold. It is not a true return, if the effect retains its qualities, even when withdrawn into the cause.[5] If it is said that, as the world loses its special qualities and gets absorbed into Īśvara, there is then no reason for it to go forth again, differentiated into the enjoyers and the enjoyed which we have in every new world-period, Śaṁkara answers this objection by an analogy. "As the soul in deep sleep and meditation returns (temporarily) into its original unity, but on waking from these states returns to its individual existence so long as it is not free from avidyā, so also is it with the return into Īśvara."[6] The force of differentiation continues in Īśvara, though it is not manifested, when the world is withdrawn into him. The basis of the recurring return of the world into existence is in the works performed in former lives which require to be atoned for. The liberated do not return since the condition of rebirth, *viz.*, false knowledge, is absent in their case.[7] Strictly speaking, there is no creation at all since saṁsāra is beginningless and endless. Creation and destruction are stages in the process of saṁsāra which is from eternity to eternity. At the beginning of every kalpa

[1] Na avaśyaṁ tasya yathādṛṣṭam eva sarvam abhyupagantavyam. See also D.S.V., pp. 92–93.

[2] S.B., ii. 1. 4.

[3] S.B., ii. 1. 6.

[4] Sthaulya, sāvayavatva, acetanatva, paricchinnatvāśuddhyādi.

[5] S.B., ii. 1. 9.

[6] S.B., ii. 1. 9.

[7] S.B., ii. 1. 9.

(world period) we have the unpacking of the original complex which contains within itself the whole range of diversity. There is continuity between the past and the present, between the state of destruction and the state of creation which succeeds it. If the supreme Īśvara and the individual jīva are related as whole and part, the former should be subject to pain, whenever the jīva suffers. To get over this difficulty, the relation of whole and part is interpreted as one of original and reflection. Any injury to the reflection does not affect the original.

It is said that God cannot be the cause of the world where some are treated well and some ill, and he who inflicts such varying lots on his creatures is unjust and cruel.[1] The difficulty is overcome by the recognition of the law of karma. God does not act arbitrarily, but acts with reference to the good and evil works of each creature in its earlier births. God brings about a creation suited to the deeds of men. Since the world is only a scene of atonement for the works of an earlier existence, the rôle of God as creator is a secondary one. We cannot attribute to the gardener what is due to the vital forces of the plant. Śaṁkara compares God to rain which helps the plants to grow, while what they grow into depends not on the rain but on the nature of the seed. Each individual's new life is determined by the moral quality of his acts.[2] But it may be asked, Why did not God create a world free from suffering, misery, at the very beginning, when there was neither merit nor demerit in the individuals to determine his action. This leads to circular reasoning. Śaṁkara says: "Without merit and demerit, no one can come into existence; again, without an individual no merit and demerit can exist, so that on the doctrine of the world having a beginning we are led into a logical see-saw."[3] The world is beginningless (anādi).[4] Each existence in it owes its nature to some prior existence. Even in periodical creations and returns the law of karma is observed, and saṁsāra in a subtle or gross form subsists in the nature of God. Prakṛti, or the principle of the world, which is itself no effect and is therefore superior to all effects,[5] exists in him. The spring has no source outside Īśvara, and so māyā or prakṛti is made a part of the nature of God. Īśvara, *i.e.* Brahman associated with prakṛti, is the efficient and the material cause of the world. The world as the effect of Īśvara persists even before it is created in the form of the causal self (kāraṇātmanā), even as it persists through his power in creation.[6] Even prior to creation the nāmarūpa (name and form) is the object of Īśvara's knowledge.[7]

The Upaniṣads believe in the immanence of God. They declare that God is not separated from the individual soul, but, by means of

[1] S.B., ii. 1. 34. [2] S.B., i. 3. 39. [3] S.B., ii. 1. 36.
[4] S.B., ii. 3. 42.
[5] Sarvasmād vikārāt paro yo 'vikāraḥ (S.B., i. 2. 22).
[6] S.B., ii. 1. 6. See S.B. on Kaṭha Up., iii. 11; Chān., viii. 14. 1.
[7] S.B., i. 1. 5

it, he himself has entered into nature. "As the absolutely pure he would not enter the impure body with his own self, and even if he had done so, he would leave it remembering that he himself had made it. Without any trouble, the soul in whose form God entered the world would put an end to the world, even as the magician does to the glamour produced by himself. Since this does not occur, it follows that the world is not created by a spiritual being who knows what is good for himself."[1] Śaṁkara answers this objection by pointing to the production of different kinds of effects from one cause. The same earth brings forth many kinds of stones, costly jewels as well as ordinary stones. So also from one God a variety of souls and effects follow.[2]

Īśvara creates without implements. He is able to transform himself into manifold effects by his great powers.[3] No outside co-operation is necessary for God who possesses all the necessary powers perfect within himself. It is said that God and the ṛṣis can create many things through the sheer force of meditation, without the aid of anything external.[4] His work of creation is not like human acts.[5] By the specific quality of his nature, God transforms himself into the world even as milk is changed into curd.[6] Since the manifold world arises from Īśvara, the latter is assigned a multiplicity of powers.[7] If Īśvara is essentially free, he cannot be under any compulsion to create. God has no imperfections, no unfulfilled desires. The attribution of any motive (prayojana) to God conflicts with his all-sufficiency.[8] If the world issued for some purpose or expressed some desire or fulfilled some want, then it would betray a sense of need and incompleteness in the Supreme. If he created with no definite aim, then his acts would be no better than a child's. If God were the sole cause, the whole effect should have been present at once; but, as a matter of fact, we have a slowly unfolding growth which seems to indicate different causes for different stages. It is said in reply that action is not necessarily determined from without. It may be determined by motives intrinsic to the activity itself. So it is said that "the activity of the Lord may be supposed to be mere sport (līlā) proceeding from his own nature, without reference to any purpose."[9] The creative activity of Īśvara is the undesired overflow of his perfection, which cannot rest sterilely in itself. The conception of līlā conveys a number of suggestions. The act of creation is not motived

[1] S.B., ii. 1. 21.
[2] S.B., ii. 1. 23.
[3] Paripūrṇaśaktikam (S.B., ii. 1. 24).
[4] ii. 1. 25, 31.
[5] S.B., i. 4. 27.
[6] Kṣīravad dravyasvabhāvaviśeṣāt (S.B., ii. 1. 24). The analogy of milk is unsound, since the change of milk into curds requires the association of warmth.
[7] S.B., ii. 1. 30.
[8] Nityaparitṛptatvam (S.B., ii. 1. 32–33). Brahman is prāptakāmaḥ of realised purpose, and so the teleology of finite consciousness cannot apply to him.
[9] S.B., ii. 1. 33.

by any selfish interest. It is the spontaneous overflow of God's nature (svabhāva), even as it is the nature of man to breathe in and out.[1] God cannot help creating. The work of the world is not the result of chance or thoughtlessness, but is simply the outcome of God's nature. Out of the fulness of his joy, God scatters abroad life and power.[2] Śaṁkara does not regard the infinite as something which exists in itself first and then feels itself under a necessity to go out into the finite. He creates out of the abundance of his joy and for the fulfilment of the demands of morality. By looking upon creation as the cosmic game in which the Supreme indulges, Śaṁkara brings out the purposiveness, rationality, ease and effortlessness with which the creation is sustained. The liberated are called upon to share the joy of Īśvara. The finite centres are distinguishable not from but within the whole, and the whole is also the ideal for the selves to attain to. Even things that seem to be unspiritual and unreasonable belong to the whole. The life of Īśvara throbs in all parts unifying and containing all. " All living creatures from Brahmā down to plants are regarded as my body." [3] Īśvara and the world, the cause and the effect, are identical. They are not identical as forms or modifications, but are identical in their fundamental nature of Brahman. The world in creation is developed in name and form, while it is in an undeveloped state in dissolution. Creation is the expression in the plane of space-time of what exists already in God.[4] At the end of each of the world periods (kalpas) Īśvara takes back the whole world, *i.e.* the material world becomes merged in non-distinct prakṛti, while the individual souls, free for the time being from actual connection with upādhis, lie in deep slumber as it were. But as the consequences of their deeds are not yet exhausted, they have again to enter an embodied existence as soon as Īśvara sends forth a new material world. Then the old round of birth, action and death, etc., begins anew.[5]

The individual souls which are different from one another are regarded as parts of Īśvara, which are, however, not confused. The

[1] S.B., ii. 1. 33.

[2] Cp. with this the Plotinian conception of Spirit as overflowing perfection.

[3] *Upadeśasāhasrī*, ix. 4 ; *Dakṣiṇāmūrti Stotra*, p. 9.

[4] Cp. Emily Brontë :

" Though earth and man were gone,
And suns and universes ceased to be,
And Thou wert left alone,
Every existence would exist in Thee."

[5] The one supreme Lord is called Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva according as he is creating, preserving and withdrawing the whole universe. Creation (sṛṣṭi) is the function of Īśvara enveloped in sattva or Brahmā. Withdrawal (pralaya) is the function of Īśvara enveloped in tamas or Śiva, while subsistence (sthiti), with its upward and downward tendencies, is the function of Īśvara enveloped in rajas or Viṣṇu.

works and fruits of different souls, which at death return to their source and proceed out again to a new existence,[1] do not intermingle.[2] The individual soul as identified with the material body is the jīva, or the dehin, or the embodied. The unity of all these jīvas, the collective or cosmic self in the waking state, is Virāj or Vaiśvānara. As identified with the subtle body as in the dream state, the individual is the liṅgin, or the taijasa. The unity of all the taijasas or subtle selves is Hiraṇyagarbha or Sūtrātman.[3] Lastly, as identified with the kāraṇaśarīra, the individual is called prājña, and the unity of all prājñas is Īśvara. The individual in the state of dreamless sleep has still the element of duality. He has buddhi, the spring of thought and volition. Īśvara, in the state of withdrawal, is like the jīva in suṣupti, connected with the principle of duality, though it is not manifested. Īśvara is Brahman enclosed in pure buddhi. He has the three guṇas, and is also said to transcend them. He is said to be invested with a transparent body of pure sattva. From Īśvara to Virāj, from dreamless sleep to waking, from prājña to dehin is the order of sṛṣṭi (creation), or progressive materialisation, the reverse being that of pralaya, or progressive idealisation. Śaṁkara admits actual transformation (pariṇāma) in the phenomenal world, though he employs the conception of appearance (vivarta) to indicate the relation of the world to Brahman.

A material cause is that which brings about a product not different from the cause.[4] The world is not different from Brahman, which as the existent (sadrūpeṇa) appears to undergo change; it is also different from avidyā, which as the non-intelligent (jaḍena) undergoes change. The world thus is a mixture of Brahman and māyā. While Śaṁkara is explicit that Īśvara is the efficient as well as the material cause of the universe,[5] in later Advaita differences arise. According to the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, the cause of the evolution of the world is māyā and not Brahman.[6] Vācaspati holds that while Brahman is the cause, māyā is the auxiliary (sahakāri). Brahman looked at as an object by the individuals affected by māyā is the non-intelligent world, and is said to be the cause of it.[7] But this view takes for granted the māyā which affects the jīvas. The insentience (jaḍatā) of the world must be due to something else than Brahman pure and simple, and it is perhaps better to say that the world with its finite-infinite nature is to be traced to Brahman-māyā; and since we are not in a position to account for the relation of the world to Brahman, we may say that Brahman is the substratum of the world which is a product of

[1] Chān. Up., vi. 10. [2] S.B., ii. 3. 49. [3] S.B., ii. 3. 15.

[4] Svābhinnakāryajanakatvam upādānatvam.

[5] A view which is supported by *Vivaraṇa*.

[6] Prapañcasya pariṇāmy upādānam māyā na brahmety, siddhāntaḥ.

[7] Vācaspatimiśrās tu, jīvāśṛtamāyāviṣayīkṛtam brahma svata eva jāḍyāśrayaprapañcākāreṇa vivartamānatayopādānam iti māyāsahakārimātram (S.L.S., i).

māyā. This view is adopted by *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*.[1] The author of *Siddhāntamuktāvali* feels strongly against subjecting Brahman to any kind of relation, and so holds that māyā alone is the cause of the world. The author of *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka* regards the absolute Brahman as the material cause of the world, since all that is must belong to the one reality. Others who decline to attribute any kind of relation to Brahman, look upon Īśvara, *i.e.* Brahman as related to māyā, as the material cause.[2] If material causality is attributed to the absolute Brahman, it is only accidentally (taṭasthatayā). Vidyāraṇya holds that the cause which changes into the world is māyā,[3] while that which is the basis of the world is the pure consciousness limited by māyā.[4] There are thinkers who believe that the gross objective world is the effect of Īśvara's māyā, while the subtle world of mind, sense, etc., is the product of the individual jīva, aided by the māyā of God.[5] There are others who attribute the subjective world to the force of avidyā, and do not find any necessity for the co-operation of Īśvara's māyā, assigning to the latter only the elemental universe. When we look at the question from the two different points of view, objective and subjective, Brahman is the basis on which the objective world is imposed, while Ātman is the basis on which the subjective is imposed. While the ultimate reality is the material cause of the entire practical world of sense and activity, the jīva is the material cause of the world of apparent things and of the dream world. While all these views refuse to make the world the product of the individual subject or the jīva, there are some thinkers who are of opinion that the jīva is the material cause of all, projecting within itself the whole order of things from Īśvara downwards, even as it projects a dream world.[6]

XXVIII

The Phenomenal Character of Īśvara

It is indifferent whether we say that Brahman, cast in the moulds of logic, is the world of experience or that it is Īśvara.

[1] Prapañce ubhayor api māyā brahmaṇor upādānatvam; tatra ca pariṇāmitayā māyayā upādānatvam; adhiṣṭhānatayā ca brahmaṇa upādānatvam. Brahmavivartamānatayā, avidyāpariṇāmamānatayā upādānam (Commentary on S.L.S., i).

[2] *Vivaraṇa*, which takes its stand on S.B., i. 1. 20; i. 2. 1.

[3] Pariṇāmyupādānatā.

[4] Vivartopādānatā is attributed to māyopahitacaitanyam.

[5] Viyadādiprapañca Īśvarasṛṣṭamāyāpariṇāma iti; tatra Īśvara upādānam; antaḥkaraṇādikaṁ tu, Īśvarāśṛtamāyāpariṇāma mahābhūtopaśṛṣṭajīvāvidyākṛtabhūtasūkṣmā kāryam iti, tatrobhayor upādānatvam (S.L.S., i).

[6] Appayadīkṣita describes their position thus: "Jīva eva svapnadraṣṭṛvat svasminn Īśvarādisarvakalpakatvena sarvakāraṇam ity api kecit."

Īśvara is all-comprehensive and contains within himself all that exists, potentially in pralaya and actually in creation. There does not seem to be much point in Deussen's observation, that Śaṁkara did not carefully distinguish Brahman, the undifferentiated, from the phenomenal world on the one hand, and Īśvara on the other. He says: "This undifferentiated Brahman has two contraries: first the *forms of the phenomenal world*, as Brahman, conditioned by upādhis, appears; then the imperfect *figurative ideas*, which we form of the Godhead, in order to bring it nearer to our understanding and our worship. It is strange that between these two contraries of the undifferentiated Brahman, however wide apart they naturally are, Śaṁkara draws no sharp distinction, and even if, according to one passage, it seems as if he saw in the *phenomenal forms* the basis (ālambanam) of the *presentation forms*, yet from the continual intermingling of the two . . . it follows that our author never became clearly conscious of the difference between them."[1] Deussen agrees that Śaṁkara referred to this distinction in one passage[2] and dismissed it as meaningless (vyartha). The whole phenomenal world is the appearance of Brahman. Brahman, on which all rests, becomes Īśvara, which includes all, when shaped by the phenomenal forms. The distinction between the infinite Īśvara on the one side and the individual souls on the other is a distinction of different members of a whole, analogous to that between the kingdoms of Magadha and Vaideha, which belong to the same world.[3] When Brahman the real is conceived as Brahman the saṁsāra, God, man and the world (Īśvara, jīva, prapañca) become the chief elements.

Theoretical philosophy, interested in deducing the world of being from the first principle of an absolute self which has nothing contingent about it, is obliged, whether in East or West, to accept some principle of self-expression (māyā), of objectivity (prakṛti). In European thought Kant contended that there was no experience apart from the transcendental unity of apperception, and yet he made this purely formal, and so failed to derive the whole of experience from it. By regarding experience as an interaction between the trans-

[1] D.S.V., pp. 205–206. [2] S.B., iii. 2. 21. [3] S.B., iii. 2. 31.

cendental unity of apperception and the things in themselves, he introduced into his system an element of irrational contingency. Fichte accepts from Kant the central truth that all experience is only for a subject, and attempts to develop the whole of experience from it. He holds that in the development of the subject there is no intrusion of a foreign factor, but every step is determined from within. The absolute subject gives itself an " other " in the very act of self-positing. The self cannot affirm or posit itself except by oppositing or distinguishing from itself a not-self. The element of otherness is brought about within the very being of the self. Gradually we have the differentiation of the absolute self into a multiplicity of finite egos at once other than itself and modes of itself. The self of Fichte has thus to throw up from itself a check or an impediment, a not-self, as the very condition of its becoming aware of its activity. The self limitation of the primal consciousness, or the rise of the obstacle against which the self breaks itself, has to be assumed, however incomprehensible it may be. Similarly in the conception of Īśvara we have, besides the absolute Brahman, the element of objectivity or prakṛti, self-expression or māyā.

When we start from the human end, we must offer some explanation of the world of becoming. It cannot be due to Brahman, which is immutable. If Brahman itself changes, it ceases to be Brahman. If it never ceases to be itself, *i.e.* never changes, the change we come across remains unexplained. The changing universe cannot be traced to prakṛti, which is unintelligent. While Brahman stands for being, prakṛti stands for becoming. But to posit prakṛti by the side of Brahman as an ultimate category would be to limit the nature of Brahman, which has no second, nothing outside ; but if no second is posited, the explanation of the world becomes difficult. The only way is through the recognition of a saguṇa Brahman or changing Brahman, an Īśvara who combines within himself the natures of both being and becoming, the unattached Brahman and the unconscious prakṛti. The indeterminate for thought becomes the self-determined. The primal unity goes out of itself and produces a manifestation relatively independent of it. The pure, simple, self-subsistent Absolute becomes the personal Lord, the principle of being

in the universe binding all things to each other in binding them to himself. Brahman is what is beyond both subject and object. When it becomes subject dealing with an object, we have Īśvara, the Logos, the one-many. The blank objectivity or prakṛti, develops the whole world through the power of the subject, God. By itself prakṛti or the object, has no existence or meaning. It is unintelligent, and so cannot cause anything without the aid of an intelligent spirit. It is merely the other of the subject and the world is the heterisation or the othering of Īśvara, the self-conscious Brahman. Īśvara combines the two principles of Brahman and prakṛti. He is not pure consciousness (caitanya) but a self-conscious personality. "He designed (aikṣata), I will become many, I will procreate." [1] Knowledge, self-consciousness and personality are possible only if there are objects. Omniscience (sarvajñatva) characterises God, though its possibility is explained in different ways.[2] The nature of Brahman is jñāna, or knowledge. This takes the shape of an effect when it is limited by an object to be known. Then in relation to that object is Brahman known as Vijñātṛ, or the subject of knowledge. In other words, Brahman, whose nature is knowledge, becomes a knower, when he is confronted with an object to be known.[3] Śaṁkara agrees with Rāmānuja and Hegel in thinking that a not-self remains an integral element of personality. Only, while they regard the conception of personality as the highest, Śaṁkara declares that we are in the world of phenomena, so long as we have the consciousness of not-self. To reach the real, we must transcend this distinction. When pure being becomes related being, its first relation must be to something different from being. That which is different from being is

[1] Chān., vi. 2. 3. See also Ait., i. 1. 1; Praśna, vi. 3. 4; Muṇḍ., i. 1. 9.

[2] Bhāratītīrtha makes out that Īśvara is conditioned by māyā, in which abide the subtle impressions of the minds of all creatures. The author of *Prakaṭārtha* agrees with this, and remarks that as māyā is coextensive with the phenomenal world, past, present and future, it enables its possessor to have all-comprehensive knowledge. The author of *Tattvaśuddhi* observes that God's knowledge need not always be direct. While the whole of the present world is directly cognised by God, he may remember the past and anticipate the future. The author of *Kaumudī* holds that God as having the characteristics of Brahman is the illuminator of all objects. See S.B., i. 4. 9, and *Siddhāntaleśa*, i.

[3] This is the view of Vācaspati also.

not-being.[1] Īśvara, who is different from Brahman, or the unbroken energy of light, is the light affirming itself in and through darkness. He is the principle of truth creating order of chaos, the spirit of God brooding on the face of the waters.[2] The darkness tries to overwhelm and eclipse the light and seeks to cover all, and the light is always busy overtaking the darkness. While there is an essential antagonism between Brahman and darkness, between Īśvara and darkness, there is struggle and ultimate victory of light over darkness. Īśvara is thus the mediating principle between Brahman and the world, sharing the natures of both. He is one with Brahman, and yet related to the object world. Śaṁkara holds that even before creation, the personal Īśvara has an object in " the names and forms which are neither to be defined as beings nor as their opposites, which are not evolved though striving towards evolution." [3] We have here the ultimate spirit viewed as ego contemplating the non-ego as its object. For Īśvara, changelessness and inactivity are impossible. As real in the empirical sense, he must be ever acting, losing himself to find himself, going out to the universe and returning to himself through the universe. He who does nothing and stands aloof from the world is not God, not at any rate a God of love. Love lives in the life of its objects, exhibiting the sorrow though not the guilt of wrong-doing and sin and the joy of righteous living. For Śaṁkara, as for many other philosophers, a self-conscious being which has no object, which does not possess its opposite and does not affirm its unity in terms of it, is impossible. It is through its manifestations or objects that a self-conscious personality lives, moves and has its being. Yet it is necessary to hold that it is in no way affected by the changes of its object, a thesis which it is difficult to maintain. The events of nature and the change of souls bring about alterations in the nature of Īśvara. The *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* openly admits that the activities of living beings produce various modifications of māyā

[1] Cp. " And the light shineth in darkness " (St. John i. 5). Bishop Westcott, commenting on it, writes : " Side by side with the light, the darkness appears suddenly and without preparation " (*The Gospel according to St. John*, p. 5).

[2] See Introduction, S.B.G.

[3] S.B., i. 1. 5. " Anirvacanīye, nāmarūpe avyākṛte vyācikīrṣite."

or prakṛti, which is the upādhi or the body of Īśvara.[1] The appearance and disappearance of the world shows that the Divine nature undergoes change, contraction and expansion. So long as creation and destruction are real movements in the life of God, the latter is not above time but is subject to time; so that, even as creation and destruction belong to the empirical world, Īśvara belongs to it. We employ the category of change which demands a permanence and argue that Īśvara is the permanent background, to whose body these changes pertain.[2] Īśvara assumes an undeveloped subtle body, forming the seed plot for names and forms, and serving as the groundwork for the Lord, and yet only as a limitation ascribed to himself.[3] The admission of a formless matter co-eternal with God clearly involves limitations on the infinity of God. To say that the limitations are not those of an external, more or less intractable material, does not help us much.

While the saguṇa Brahman changes, it is maintained that it still remains within its constitutive idea, so that the alterations are all in the accidents and not in the essentials. Īśvara's oneness is not impaired by self-expression in the many.[4] "As the magician is not affected by the māyā which he has himself created, since it is unreal, so also the Supreme is not affected by the māyā of saṁsāra." [5] Thus Śaṁkara attempts to combine the ideas of the negation of the finite and the presupposition of the finite in his conception of Īśvara. The charge against Spinoza that he reduces the Absolute to a mere blank of indeterminate being, which he inconsistently transforms into the self-determining God, has no force against Śaṁkara, who commits no such sublime inconsequence. He is clearly conscious that the negation of all the determinations of the finite can give us only an abstract being of which nothing can be said except that it is. So long as we

[1] Sṛjyamānaprāṇikarmavaśena parameśvaropādhibhūtamāyāyāṁ vṛttiviśeṣā idam idānīṁ sraṣṭavyam, idam idānīm pālayitavyam, idam idānīm saṁhartavyam ityādyākārā jāyante, tāsāṁ ca vṛttīnāṁ sāditvāt tatpratibimbitacaitanyam api sādīty ucyate (i).

[2] S.B., ii. 1. 4. In the *Dakṣiṇāmūrti Stotra* it is said: "All that is moving or unmoving in the universe—earth, water, air, fire, ether, the sun, the moon and the spirit—is but the eightfold form of Him, and there is nothing whatever which on reflection is other than the Supreme Lord."

[3] Avyākṛtaṁ nāmarūpabījaśaktirūpam, bhūtasūkṣmam īśvarāśrayam, tasyaivopādhibhūtam (S.B., i. 2. 22).

[4] Chān., viii. 14. 1; vi. 3. 2; Tait. Ar., iii. 12. 7; Śvet. Up., vi. 12.

[5] S.B., ii. 1. 9. Yathā svayaṁprasāritayā māyayā māyāvī triṣv api kāleṣu na saṁspṛśyate 'vastutvāt, evam paramātmāpi saṁsāramāyayā na saṁspṛśyata iti.

are employing the methods of logic, the highest reality is not the indeterminate Brahman but determinate Īśvara, who is the source of all the manifold changes of the universe. But there is throughout Śaṁkara's philosophy the pervading prejudice against the adequacy of logic and the finality of its ideal, and so we find that this conception of saguṇa Brahman, or concrete spirit, is, according to him, so riddled with self-contradictions and inconsistencies that it cannot be regarded as the highest reality.

That Īśvara is the home of all finite existence, the material and the efficient cause of the world, is an assumption. It is quite easy to say that the concrete universal combines the reality of the universal and the particular, but the how of it is a mystery. If the relation of identity and difference, permanence and change, is unintelligible in the world of experience, it cannot become intelligible when applied to Īśvara. Śaṁkara knows that his view is open to the charge of abstract identity, but he believes that identity and difference cannot be logically related. *How* the two can coexist he feels that he does not know.[1] The conception of Īśvara as a concrete whole is not so much an explanation of experience as a restatement of the problem. Our experience has in it the two features of identity and difference, or permanence and change. We ask how is the experience, which is a complex of souls and things and characterised by permanence and change, to be accounted for, and we answer that Īśvara is the explanation of experience, since he combines both these features and has the world of souls and things organically related to him. To say that they constitute his body is not to explain experience. We frame a generalised concept of experience and call it Īśvara. The explanation of the experienced world is that world itself, which in its general terms is called Īśvara. Rāmānuja and Hegel hold that the ultimate reality is a one containing many. For them the rational is the real: God and the world are both real. The indeterminateness of intuition and the mystery of reality do not appeal to them. They are interested not in the real in itself but the real for thought, which has an element of negativity in it. The process of thought consists in the continual absorbing and transcending by mind of its own discrepant and rebellious parts. So all spiritual life is an unceasing struggle with refractory elements. Divine life is regarded as an eternal activity. To think of the world as a logical unity or a single system is to think of it as the manifestation of one perfectly determinate principle in an

[1] Śaṁkara would not have found much help in the realist theory of the reality of the universals along with that of the particulars, for the universals of the realists do not claim infinity. They are finite reals, though of a different order from the particulars, and if God is a universal of this character, he can realise himself in various ways simply because he is finite. Were he infinite, he could only act in one way, or rather, Śaṁkara would say, he could not act at all. He could only *be* and not become, and there is then no question of his activity or manifestation.

infinity of details. But we should not overlook the difficulties attending this conception of the highest as the concrete universal or the union of the finite and the infinite.

Śaṁkara believes that the aim of the scriptural accounts of creation is to establish the identity of Brahman and the world.[1] If the world were not identical with God, and if he created it as a substance separate from himself, then he would be guilty of the charge of making efforts under the influence of motives. In other words, he is no God at all.[2] If he acts in obedience to the law of karma, then he is limited by it. We have referred to Fichte's conception of the self which comes to self-consciousness by breaking itself, so to speak, against some obstacle and by being reflected back, as it were, upon itself from this obstacle. Such a self is really dependent on its other, of which it is said to be the source and support. The self cannot precede the world nor can it survive it. If we succeed in abolishing the not-self, we at the same time succeed in abolishing the self. When Fichte becomes vaguely aware of these consequences, he rises to the conception of a reality which is "neither subject nor object but the ground of both." Śaṁkara recognises most clearly what Fichte was groping after, that subject and object are distinctions of logic which have no meaning when we speak of the source of all logic. The Absolute is neither the bearer of knowledge nor the object of knowledge, but knowledge itself (jñānam). If the whole world is regarded as an objectification of the thought of God, existing in order that he might perpetually maintain himself as self-conscious of the world as an object, then such a God is only relative and not absolute;[3] for "The Absolute does not want to make eyes at itself in a mirror or like a squirrel in a cage, to revolve the circle of its own perfections."[4] In short, personality is not the ultimate category of the universe. Plotinus observes: "All that has self-consciousness and self-intellection is derivative."[5] So beyond the

[1] Evam utpattyādiśrutīnām aikātmyāvagamaparatvāt (S.B., iv. 3. 14). See also S.B., ii. 1. 33.

[2] S.B., ii. 2. 37.

[3] Māyopādhir jagadyoniḥ sarvajñatvādilakṣaṇaḥ (*Vākyavṛtti*, p. 45).

[4] *Appearance and Reality*, p. 172.

[5] *Enneads*, iii. 9. 3, McKenna's E.T., vol. ii, p. 141.

personal Īśvara is Brahman the Absolute, lifted above all self-divisions and holding together both absolute objectivity and subjectivity in the unbreakable bond of absolute consciousness.

There is a gap between the intuited Brahman which is devoid of logical determinations and the conceived Brahman which is the productive principle, which explains difference and at the same time overcomes it. The indeterminate Brahman in itself will seem to the logical intellect, as the dark in which all colours become grey. If it should serve as an explanation of the finite at all, it can only be through the introduction of the very form of the finite into the heart of the absolute. If we attempt to *think* pure being, we at the same time think *non-being,* and from the interaction of the two the becoming of the universe follows. Strictly speaking, even God *becomes.* The contradiction of being-non-being appears in his own inward nature. Perhaps Īśvara may not himself come to be, but still he makes his meaning explicit in an unending process of becoming. Being and non-being are aspects of one and the same reality, the positive substance and the negative shadow of the same reality. The criticism that Śaṁkara leaves us with an unbridgeable chasm at the summit of things, between the nirguṇa Brahman of which nothing can be said and the saguṇa Brahman which embraces and unifies all experience, is due to a confusion of standpoints. Thought can never overleap the distinction of subject and object, and so the highest for thought is the absolute subject with the object in it, but behind the subject and the object we have Brahman.

XXIX

The Phenomenality of the World

the world, both unity and cannot be equally real. " Were both unity and multiplicity real, we could not say of one whose standpoint is that of worldly action that he is caught in untruth . . . it could not be said ' from knowledge comes deliverance ' ; moreover, in that case the knowledge of manifoldness cannot be transcended

by the knowledge of unity."[1] Judged by the tests of reality, the world of experience reveals its phenomenal character. All particular facts and events as objects stand over against the knowing subject. Whatever is an object of knowledge is liable to destruction.[2] Śaṁkara holds that the distinction between reality and seeming, substance and show, is identical with that between subject and object. While the objects which are perceived are unreal, the Ātman which perceives but is not itself perceived is real.[3] While distinguishing waking objects from dream ones, Śaṁkara urges that the two, in so far as they are objects of consciousness, are unreal.[4] The real is what is free from self-contradiction, but the world is full of contradictions. The world of space, time and cause is not self-explanatory. There is no principle of reconciliation in the finite world by which its difficulties are dissolved. Space, time and cause, which are the forms of all experience, are not ultimates. The real is obscured by them. If we get beyond the distinctions of places, moments and events, it is said, the world of diversity will collapse into a single unit.[5] Experience cast in the moulds of space, time and cause is phenomenal only. The real is what is present in all times.[6] It is that which ever was, is and will be.[7] The real cannot be present to-day and absent to-morrow. The world of experience is not present at all times and is therefore not real. When insight into reality is gained, the world of experience is transcended. The world is said to be unreal since it is

[1] S.B., ii. 1. 14.

[2] Yad dṛśyaṁ tan naśyam.

[3] Cp. "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

[4] Dṛśyatvam asatyatvaṁ ca aviśiṣṭam ubhayatra (S.B. on Gauḍapāda's *Kārikā*, ii. 4.

[5] Cp. Asti bhāti priyaṁ rūpaṁ nāma cety aṁśapañcakam
Ādyaṁ trayaṁ brahmarūpaṁ jagadrūpaṁ tato dvayam.
See Appaya Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntaleśa*, ii.

[6] Traikālikādyabādhyatvam.

[7] Kālatrayasattāvat. Cp. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*:—

"Yat tu kālāntareṇāpi nānyasaṁjñām upaiti vai
Pariṇāmādisaṁbhūtaṁ tad vastu. . . ." (ii. 13. 95).

The real is that which even by the passage of time does not acquire a different designation derived from change of form and the like. Cp. the words of the Christian Liturgy: "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end."

sublated by true knowledge.[1] The recognition of a higher condemns the lower to the level of unreality. The objects of the world are changeable. They never are, but always become. Nothing that changes is real, which is eternal transcendent being. Says Śaṁkara: "What is eternal cannot have a beginning, and whatever has a beginning is not eternal."[2] Our understanding is not satisfied with objects that change, only those that do not change are real.[3] What is real cannot not be. If anything is real in saṁsāra, it cannot cease to be real in mokṣa. In this sense, the changing world is not real. The world is neither pure being nor pure non-being. Pure being is not an existence nor an item of the world process. Pure non-being is not a valid concept, for were it so, absolute nothingness would be an entity, and that which is by hypothesis the negation of all existence will have to be granted existence. Nothing is not a thing. What exists is becoming, which is neither being nor non-being, since it produces effects.[4] At no point can the world reach being and stop becoming. The world is bound up in the historical process of struggling to become the infinite, though it never attains infinity. There is always something beyond the created universe.[5] The realisation of the Ātman is the final end (avasāna) of all worldly activities,[6] which is not reached so long as the world as world persists. The relation of Īśvara to the māyā world is beginningless (anādi). The relation of being and non-being is one of exclusion of contradiction, and the former tries to overcome non-being, negate it by transforming into being. This is the aim of the process of becoming presided over by Īśvara, who is ever active in pushing non-being out of existence and bringing

[1] Jñānaikanivartyatvam. "As soon as consciousness of non-duality arises in us, the transmigratory state of the individual soul and the creative quality of Īśvara vanish at once, the whole phenomenon of plurality which springs from wrong knowledge being sublated by perfect knowledge" (S.B., iii. 2. 4; *Ātmabodha*, vi and vii).

[2] Nahi nityaṁ kenacid ārabhyate, loke yad ārabdhaṁ tad anityam (S.B., Tait. Up., Introduction).

[3] Yadviṣayā buddhir na vyabhicarati tat sat; yadviṣayā buddhir vyabhicarati tad asat. See also S.B., i. 1. 4; Tait. Up., ii. 1.

[4] Arthakriyākāri. Cp. Sureśvara: "Mere nonentity is not amenable to proof, either as separate from or identical with entity. Hence entity alone can give rise to practice" (*Vārttika*, p. 927).

[5] S.B., iv. 3. 14.

[6] S.B.G., xviii. 50.

forward an eternal procession of existence out of it ; but, at the logical level, it is an impossible feat to force non-being into the equivalence of being. The world process is engaged in this interminable task. From the beginning to the end of things it is always a question of light invading the realm of darkness. We may push it farther and farther. It only recedes, but never disappears. The relation of being to non-being in the finite world is not one of exclusion but one of polar opposition. The ideas are at once antithetic and correlative. Neither of them attains actuality except through its contrast with the other. However much the one may penetrate the other or be penetrated by it, the distinction and contrast are always there, so that everything in the world is unstable and doomed to be fugitive. Even the highest principle in the world process, the personal God, has in him the shadow of non-being. Brahman alone is pure being, possessing whatever there is of reality in all things, without their limitations or elements of non-being. Whatever is different from it is unreal.[1] The nature of saṁsāra is always to become what it is not, to transform itself by transcending itself. " The world neither is nor is not, and so its nature is indescribable." [2] While it is different from being and non-being,[3] it shares the characters of both.[4] All finite things, as Plato says, are made up of being and non-being.[5] The bewildering mass of phenomenal diversity must belong to reality, for there is nothing else in which it can be, and yet it is not reality. So it is said to be a phenomenon or appearance of reality.[6] All finite existence is, in the words of Bosanquet, " the great ultimate contradiction of the finite-infinite nature." Heaven and earth shall pass away, our body decays, our senses change and our empirical egos are built up before our eyes. None of these is ultimately real. The abstract expression of this phenomenality of the world is māyā.

1 Brahmabhinnaṁ sarvam mithyā brahmabhinnatvāt (*Vedāntaparibhāṣā*).

2 Tattvānyatvābhyām anirvacanīyā. . . . Cp. Plotinus, *Enneads*, iii. 6, 7, McKenna's E.T., vol. ii, p. 78.

3 Sadasadvilakṣaṇa.

4 Sadasadātmaka.

5 Satyānṛte mithunīkṛtya (S.B., Introduction).

6 Vikalpo na hi vastu (Śaṁkarānanda on B.G., iv. 18).

XXX

The Doctrine of Māyā

Let us now try to understand the significance of the doctrine of māyā,[1] which is the chief characteristic of the Advaita system. The world is regarded as māyā, since it cannot be accepted as real for reasons stated in the previous section. What is the relation between the real Brahman and the unreal world? For Śaṁkara, the question is an illegitimate one, and so impossible of answer. When
Brahman, the question of the nature of the world and its relation to Brahman does not arise, for the truth which disarms all discussion is seen as a fact. If we take our stand on logic, then there is no pure Brahman which requires to be related to the world. It is because we shift our standpoint in the course of the argument that the problem arises. For an imaginary difficulty there cannot be any real solution. Again, a relation presupposes two distincts, and if Brahman and the world are to be related, they should be regarded as

[1] In the Ṛg-Veda the word māyā occurs frequently, and is used generally to indicate the supernatural power attributed to the gods, especially to Varuṇa, Mitra and Indra. In many ancient hymns, māyā is praised as a world-sustaining power (R.V., iii. 38. 7; ix. 83. 3; i. 159. 4; v. 85. 5). Māyā in the sense of deception and cunning is the special prerogative of the asuras, against whom the devas wage continual warfare. We come across a different signification in the famous verse of the R.V. (vi. 47. 18) where Indra, by his supernatural power, is said to assume various forms:

Rūpaṁ rūpam pratirūpo babhūva
Tad asya rūpam praticakṣaṇāya
Indro māyābhiḥ pururūpa īyate
Yuktā hyasya harayaḥ śatā daśa.

'In every form has he been imagined, and all these are only to be viewed as his form. In many forms Indra wanders through his māyā or wonderful powers; harnessed are his ten-times-hundred horses." Māyā here means the power to transform oneself or assume strange forms. R.V., x. 54. 2, reads: "When grown to fulness by bodily form thou didst wander among mankind proclaiming thy strength, O Indra. Then all thy battles, of which men tell, were but a product, a creation of māyā. For never hast thou yet, either to-day or in former times, found an enemy." The deeds of Indra were products of a sportive impulse. In the *Praśna Up.* (i. 16) the term māyā is used almost in the sense of illusion. In the Śvet. Up. (iv. 10) and the B.G. (iv. 5–7; xviii. 61) we have the conception of a personal God who has the power of māyā.

distinct, but the Advaita holds that the world is not other than Brahman. Śaṁkara distinguishes between the scientific principle of causality (kāryakāraṇatva) and the philosophical principle of non-difference (ananyatva). Brahman and the world are non-different,[1] and so the question of the relation between the two is an inadmissible one. The world has its basis in Brahman.[2] But Brahman is and is not identical with the world. It is, because the world is not apart from Brahman; it is not, because Brahman is not subject to the mutations of the world. Brahman is not the sum of the things of the world. If we separate Brahman and the world, we cannot bind them except loosely, artificially and externally. Brahman and the world are one and exist as reality and appearance. The finite is the infinite, hidden from our view through certain barriers. The world is Brahman since, if Brahman is known, all questions of the world disappear. These questions arise simply because the finite mind views the world of experience as a reality in and by itself. If we know the nature of the Absolute, all finite forms and limits fall away. The world is māyā, since it is not the essential truth of the infinite reality of Brahman.

Śaṁkara asserts that it is impossible to explain through logical categories the relation of Brahman and the world. "The real is never known to have any relation with the unreal."[3] The world somehow exists and its relation to Brahman is indefinable (anirvacanīyā). Śaṁkara takes up the different attempts at explanation and finds them all unsatisfactory. To say that the infinite Brahman is the cause of the finite world and creates it, is to admit that the infinite is subject to the limitations of time. The relation of cause and effect cannot be applied to the relation of Brahman and the world, since cause has meaning only in relation to the finite modes of being where there is succession. We

[1] Ataś ca kṛtsnasya jagato brahmakāryatvāt tad ananyatvāt (S.B., ii. 1. 20).

[2] Cp. with this Spinoza's theory of causality. By calling God the immanent cause of the totality of finite things in the world he reduces the causal relation to one of substance and attribute. The relation which *natura naturans* or God bears to *natura naturata* or the universe, is analogous to that which the idea of geometrical figure bears to the various inferences which can be drawn from it. To Spinoza God and the world are correlates as much as the equality of angles in a triangle and that of the sides.

[3] Na hi sadasatoḥ saṁbandhaḥ (S.B. on Māṇḍ. Up., ii. 7).

cannot say that Brahman is the cause and the world is the effect, for this would be to distinguish Brahman from the world and make it into a thing related to another thing. Again, the world is finite and conditioned, and how can the infinite unconditioned be its cause? If the finite is the limited and the transitory, then the infinite, as the limit of the finite, is itself finite and not infinite. It is difficult to conceive how the infinite comes out of itself into the finite. Does the infinite come out at a particular instant of time under the necessity to become finite? Śaṁkara supports Gauḍapāda's theory of ajāti, or non-evolution. The world is not evolved or produced, but seems to be so, on account of limited insight. The world is non-different from (ananya), non-independent (avyatirikta) of Brahman. "The effect is the manifested world beginning with ākāśa; the cause is the highest Brahman. With this cause, in the sense of the highest reality, the effect is identical, having no existence beyond it."[1] It is a case of identity, or, in empirical terms, eternal co-existence, and not temporal succession, where alone cause as a force determines the order of events. The inmost self of the world is Brahman. If it seems to be independent of Brahman, then we must say that it is not what it appears to be.[2] Nor can we ascribe action to the infinite, since all action implies an end to be realised, an object to be achieved. If it is said that the Absolute is manifesting itself in the finite, Śaṁkara would say that it is wrong to hold that the finite manifests the Absolute. Whether there is the finite or not, the Absolute is always manifesting itself even as the sun is always shining. If we sometimes do not see the light of the sun, it is no fault of the sun. The Absolute always abides in its own nature. We cannot draw a distinction between the being of the Absolute and its expression. The one is the other. The analogy of the seed manifesting itself in the form of the tree is inapplicable, since organic growth and development are temporal processes. To apply temporal categories to the eternal is to reduce it to the level of an empirical object

[1] "Kāryam ākāśādikam bahuprapañcaṁ jagat, kāraṇam paraṁ brahma, tasmāt kāraṇāt paramārthato 'nanyatvaṁ vyatirekeṇābhāvaḥ kāryasyāva gamyate" (S.B., ii. 1. 14).

[2] See S.B., ii. 1. 14; ii. 3. 30; ii. 3. 6.

or phenomenon. To represent God as dependent for self-expression on creation is to represent him as exclusively immanent. Śaṁkara does not accept the view of pariṇāma, or transformation. Does the whole or only a part of Brahman change into the world? If it is the whole, then Brahman lies before our eyes as the world, and there is nothing transcendent which we have to seek. If it is a part that is transformed into the world, then Brahman is capable of being partitioned. If anything possesses parts, members or differences, then it is not eternal.[1] Scripture holds that Brahman is devoid of parts (niravayava).[2] When once Brahman becomes partially or totally the substance of the world, it is no longer its substance and no longer independent. If the Absolute grows and develops along with the evolution of the historical process of becoming, if some contributions are made to the life and growth of the Absolute by our actions, then the Absolute becomes relative. Yet if the Absolute abolishes all distinctions and swallows up the world of becoming, then the determinations of quality and quantity in the universe have no meaning for life. The relation of Brahman to the world is not analogous to that of a tree to its branches, or the sea to its waves, or clay to the vessels made of it, since all these employ intellectual categories of whole and part, substance and attribute. The relation between Brahman and the souls, which are both devoid of parts, cannot be either external (saṁyoga) or internal (samavāya). Do the souls inhere in Brahman or Brahman in the souls? Every attempt to bring Brahman into connection with the world of becoming ends in failure. The relation of the finite world to the infinite spirit is a mystery for human understanding. Every religious system holds that the finite is rooted in the infinite, and there is no breach of continuity between the two, and yet no system till to-day has logically articulated the relation between the two.[3] We cannot construe to ourselves the way in which the realm of appearances is bound up with the Absolute.

[1] S.B., ii. 1. 26.

[2] Śvet. Up., vi. 19; Muṇḍ. Up., ii. 1–2; Bṛh., ii. 4. 12; iii. 8. 8.

[3] S.B., ii. 1. 24–26. "To show how and why the universe is, so that finite existence belongs to it, is utterly impossible. That would imply an understanding of the whole not practicable for a mere part." "That experience should take place in finite centres and should wear the forms

Progress in knowledge may enable us to describe the phenomena which make up the objective world with ever greater detail and more accuracy, but the rise of the finite world out of the bosom of the infinite, the explanation of the historical process of saṁsāra is quite beyond us. However long the chain of our reasoning may be, however many its links, we reach a point where elucidation stops and nothing is left for us but to admit a fact capable of no further deduction. The word "māyā" registers our finiteness and points to a gap in our knowledge. The magician produces a tree before us from out of nothing. The tree *is* there, though we cannot explain it, and so we call it māyā. The much abused analogy of the rope and the snake is employed by Śaṁkara to illustrate the difficulty of the world problem. The riddle of the rope is the riddle of the universe. Why does the rope appear as the snake, is a question which schoolboys raise and philosophers fail to answer. The larger question of the appearance of Brahman as the world is more difficult. We can only say that Brahman appears as the world, even as the rope appears as the snake.[1] The relation between Brahman and Īśvara is a special application of the general problem of the relation between Brahman and the world.

Śaṁkara brings out that the world, though it hangs on Brahman, does not affect Brahman, by distinguishing that kind of causality where the cause without undergoing any change produces the effect, as vivartopādāna from pariṇāmopādāna, where the cause is itself transformed in producing the effect. Vivarta literally means a turning round, a perversion

of finite thisness is in the end inexplicable." "How there can be such a thing as appearance we do not understand" (*Appearance and Reality* pp. 204, 226, 413). According to Green, there is an eternal consciousness which is essentially timeless and perfect, and other finite consciousnesses which are incomplete, imperfect and temporal. The relation between the two, Green admits, is incapable of explanation. To ask why a perfect consciousness should go on making innumerable imperfect copies of itself is to ask why reality is what it is—a question which in the nature of things cannot be answered. See also I.P., p. 186. Cp. Schiller: "It may reasonably be contended that the whole question (of creation) is invalid because it asks too much. It demands to know nothing less than how reality came to be at all, how fact is made absolutely. And this is more than any philosophy can accomplish or need attempt" (*Studies in Humanism*)

[1] Māyāmātraṁ hy etad yat paramātmano 'vasthātrayātmanāvabhāsanaṁ rajjvā iva sarpādibhāvena. . . . (S.B., ii. 1. 9).

Brahman is that of which the vivarta, or perversion, is the world of space, etc. Vivarta signifies the appearance of the [illegible] ace [illegible] The original is, however, Brahman, of which the world may be regarded as a translation at the plane of space-time. As the translation is made for us, the original does not depend for its existence on the translation. The world of multiplicity is an aspect which reality takes for us, though not for itself. We have pariṇāma or transformation, when the milk is changed into curds, and vivarta or appearance, when the rope appears as the snake.[1] The different illustrations used by Śaṁkara of the rope and the snake, the shell and the silver, the desert and the mirage, are intended to indicate this one-sided dependence of the effect on the cause and the maintenance of the integrity of the cause. In the case of transformation, the cause and the effect belong to the same order of reality, while in that of appearance the effect is of a different order of being from the cause.[2] The world resides in Brahman even as the illusion of a snake is said to reside in the rope.

There are other interpretations of the doctrine of māyā to be met with in the Advaita treatises.[3] Māyā cannot be different from Brahman, which has no second. The universe is not due to any addition to Brahman from some other source of reality, for nothing can be added to that which is already perfect. It is therefore due to non-being. The process of the world is due to a gradual deprivation of reality. Māyā is used as the name of the dividing force, the finitising prin- e, that which measures out the immeasurable and creates in the formless.[4] This māyā is a feature of the central reality, neither identical with nor different from it. To give it an independent place would be to accept a fundamental

[1] S.B., ii. 1. 28.

[2] Pariṇāmo nāma upādānasamasattākakāryāpattiḥ; vivarto nāma upādānaviṣamasattākakāryāpattiḥ (*Ve.āntaparibhāṣā*, i.)

[3] S.B., Tait. Up., ii. 6.

Nāsadrūpā na sadrūpā māyā naivobhayātmikā
Sadasadbhyām anirvācyā mithyābhūtā sanātanī.
(*Sūrya Purāṇa*, quoted in S.P.B., i. 26.)

[4] Eka eva parameśvaraḥ kūṭasthanityo vijñānadhātur avidyayā māyayā māyāvivad anekathā vibhāvyate, nānyo vijñānadhātur asti (S.B., i. 3. 19).

dualism. It is wrong to trace back to the eternal the schism of which we are conscious in the world of experience. The moment we try to link up māyā with Brahman, the latter becomes transformed into Īśvara, and māyā denotes the śakti or the energy of Īśvara. Īśvara, however, is not in any manner affected by his māyā. If māyā exists, it will constitute a limit to Brahman; if it does not exist, even the appearance of the world cannot be accounted for. It is real enough to produce the world and not real enough to constitute a limit to Brahman. It is neither real as the Brahman nor unreal as the flower of the sky.[1] Whatever we may call it, illusive or real, it is necessary to account for life. It is an eternal power of God. The author of *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka* holds that Brahman is the material cause of the universe through the intervention of māyā, which is the essential operating condition. It is, however, regarded as a product of Brahman, a mode of Brahman's activity. It is essentially present in the world (anugata) and determines its existence (kāryasattāniyāmikā). Māyā is not a substance (dravyam), and so cannot be regarded as the material cause (upādānam). It is only a *modus operandi* (vyāpāra) which, coming itself from the material cause (Brahman), brings about the material product, *i.e.* the world.[2] According to this writer, māyā is the finitising process belonging to Brahman, and has the two properties of āvaraṇa or hiding the truth, and vikṣepa or misrepresenting it.[3] While the first is mere negation of knowledge, the second is positive generation of error. We not only do not perceive the Absolute but we apprehend something else in its place. Māyā evolves a variety of names and forms, which in their totality is the jagat or the universe. It also conceals the eternal Brahman under this aggregate of names and forms.

Māyā has the two functions of concealment of the real and the projection of the unreal. The world of variety screens us from the real.

> Some think Creation's meant to show him forth,
> I say it's meant to hide him all it can,[4]

[1] S.B., I. 4. 3.
[2] Tajjanyatve sati, tajjanyajanako vyāpāraḥ
[3] See *Vedāntasāra*, iv.
[4] Browning: *Bishop Blougram's Apology*

Since māyā is thus deceptive in character,[1] it is called avidyā or false knowledge. It is not mere absence of apprehension but positive error. When this activity is attributed to Brahman, the latter becomes Īśvara. "The one motionless, unconditioned, then became by its own power of māyā, that which is known as maker."[2]

Māyā is the energy of Īśvara, his inherent force, by which he transforms the potential into the actual world. His māyā, which is unthinkable, transforms itself into the two modes of desire (kāma) and determination (saṁkalpa). It is the creative power of the eternal God, and is therefore eternal; and by means of it the supreme Lord creates the world. Māyā has no separate dwelling-place. It is in Īśvara even as heat is in fire. Its presence is inferred from its effects.[3] Māyā is identified with the names and forms which, in their unevolved condition, inhere in Īśvara, and in their developed state constitute the world. In this sense it is synonymous with prakṛti.[4] Īśvara has less of reality than absolute being, and the other objects represent an increasing deprivation of reality. At the bottom of the scale we get something which has no positive qualities to be deprived of, that from which nothing more can be taken away, which, in a word, is there, but is there as not-being, a nothingness which rises like a blank wall where reality ends. It is not a part or a product of universal evolution, but is the unmanifested principle of multiplicity and deprivation, which is the basis of all evolution. The supreme Īśvara during creation imposes on the formless and the unqualified those forms and qualities which it possesses in itself. "This undeveloped principle is sometimes denoted by the term 'ākāśa,'[5] sometimes by the term akṣara,[6] or the indestructible, sometimes as māyā."[7] It is the material

[1] For māyā as deceit, see *Milanda*, iv. 8. 23.

[2] Aprāṇaṁ śuddham ekaṁ samabhavad atha tan māyayā kartṛsaṁjñam (*Śataślokī*, p. 24). Cp. *Pañcadaśī*, x. 1.

[3] Nistattvā kāryagamyāsya śaktir māyāgniśaktivat (*Pañcadaśī*).

[4] Cp. Īśvarasya māyāśaktiḥ prakṛtiḥ (S.B., ii. 1. 14). See also Śvet. Up., iv. 10; S.B.G., Introduction and vii. 4; S.P.B., i. 26.

[5] Bṛh. Up., iii. 8. 11.

[6] Muṇḍ., ii. 1. 2.

[7] Śvet., iv. 1. See S.B., i. 4. 3. "Avidyātmikā hi bījaśaktir avyaktaśabdanirdeśyā, tad etad avyaktaṁ kvacid ākāśaśabdanirdiṣṭaṁ kvacid akṣaraśabdoditaṁ kvacin māyeti sūcitam.

Avyaktanāmni parameśaśaktir anādyavidyā triguṇātmikā parā
Kāryānumeyā sudhiyaiva māyā yayā jagat sarvam idam prasūyate.

p. 108.)

substratum[1] in the creation of the world. It brings forth the universe in a natural order of sequence by undergoing mutations. It forms the causal body of Īśvara. Unlike the pradhāna of the Sāṁkhya, it is not independent of God.[2] It is a limitation which Īśvara imposes on himself. In prakṛti is centred the possibility of the world, even as the potentiality of the future tree is contained in the seed. This prakṛti, possessing the three guṇas,[3] cannot be described as either the self of Īśvara or different from it. It exists even in pralaya, dependent on the supreme Lord, as seed force (bījaśakti). Māyā or prakṛti becomes in the Purāṇas the loving consort of Īśvara and the principal instrument in the act of creation.[4] The world of māyā is the play of the mother of things ever eager to cast herself into infinite forms.[5] It follows that for Īśvara, or the subject, who is ever associated with the object, the universe is a necessity. God is in need of the universe, which is a necessary phase of the self-realisation of God, in Hegel's phrase.

We may bring together the different significations in which the term māyā is used in the Advaita Philosophy. (1) That the world is not self-explanatory shows its phenomenal character, which is signified by the word māyā. (2) The problem of the relation between Brahman and the world has meaning for us who admit the pure being of Brahman from the intuitive standpoint and demand an explanation of its relation to the world, which we see from the logical standpoint. We can never understand how the ultimate reality is related to the world of plurality, since the two are heterogeneous, and every attempt at explanation is bound to fail. This incomprehensibility is brought out by the term māyā. (3) If Brahman is to be viewed as the cause of the world, it is only in the sense that the world rests on Brahman, while the latter is in no way touched by it, and the world which rests on Brahman is

1 Cp. with the *materia prima* of the Thomistic Philosophy.

2 Na . . . svatantraṁ tattvam (S.B., i. 2. 22).

3 From nāyā with tamas predominant in it the five elements are said to be produced; from the same with the sattva dominant in it arise the five organs of perception as well as the inner organ nāyā with rajas in it. From the five organs of action, and from their combination the five prānas. These together constitute the liṅga, or sūkṣma śarīra.

4 Cp. also Bṛh. Up., i. 4. 3.

5 Cp. Tvam asi parabrahmamahiṣi (*Ānandalaharī*).

called māyā. (4) The principle assumed to account for the appearance of Brahman as the world is also called māyā. (5) If we confine our attention to the empirical world and employ the dialectic of logic, we get the conception of a perfect personality, Īśvara, who has the power of self-expression. This power or energy is called māyā. (6) This energy of Īśvara becomes transformed into the upādhi or limitation, the unmanifested matter (avyākṛta prakṛti), from which all existence issues. It is the object through which the supreme subject Īśvara develops the universe.[1]

XXXI

Avidyā

The concept of māyā is intimately related with that of avidyā. There are passages in Śaṁkara where the world of experience is traced to the force of avidyā. The cause of the appearance of the world is to be sought in the nature of the intellect, and not in that of Brahman. Brahman exists entire and undivided in the smallest object, and the appearance of plurality is due to the intellect which works according to the laws of space, time and causality. In the Introduction to his commentary on the *Brahma Sūtra* Śaṁkara points out how avidyā is the force that launches us into the dream of life. The tendency to confuse the transcendental and the empirical standpoints, or adhyāsa, however erroneous, is natural to the human mind. It is the result of our cognitive mechanism.[2] As we perceive by our senses sound and colour, while the reality is mere vibrations, even so we accept the variegated universe for the reality of Brahman, of which it is the effect. Through an examination of the subjective side of experience, Śaṁkara argues that we cannot attain to a knowledge of reality, so long as we are subject to avidyā, or the logical mode of thinking. Avidyā is the fall from intuition,

[1] Cp. Īśvarasyātmabhūte ivāvidyākalpite nāmarūpe tattvānyatvābhyām anirvacanīye saṁsāraprapañcabījabhūte . . . Īśvarasya māyā śaktiḥ prakṛtir iti ca śrutismṛtyor abhilapyete (S.B., ii. 1. 14). See also S.B., i. 4. 3; ii. 2. 2.

[2] S.B., Introduction.

the mental deformity of the finite self that disintegrates the divine into a thousand different fragments. Darkness is the privation of light. Avidyā is what Deussen calls "the innate tion of our knowledge,"[1] the twist of the mind which makes it impossible for it to see things except through the texture of space-time-cause. It is not conscious dissimulation, but the unconscious tendency of the finite mind, which lives by the imperfect standards of the world. It is the negative power which shuts us from our godlike existence. The appearance of Brahman as the world is due to our avidyā, even as the appearance of the rope as the snake is due to defective senses. When we see the rope as it is, the snake becomes unreal. When we see the reality of Brahman, the appearance of the world will flee away. That which is proved to be an unreality by a higher experience cannot be connected with reality except through a confusion of standpoints. The appearances stand transfigured in the Absolute. If we are asked to connect the image of the snake with the reality of the rope, we say that no connection is possible between what is and what is not. We have only to blame the eye for the image. When we see the rope as rope, there is an end of the matter, and we say that the rope *appeared* as the snake. Relativity has no cause except defective insight. It operates no farther than the fact that we see things, while there is only caitanya, or pure consciousness. Avidyā is either absence of knowledge or doubtful and erroneous knowledge. It is not simply negative, but is also positive in character (bhāvarūpa). When Śaṁkara argues that the existence of avidyā is patent to all, he means only that there is the fact of finiteness. It is said that everybody has the feeling that he does not know everything.[2] The evidence for its existence is universal in scope, since all finite minds share the deficiency.

Avidyā in the Upaniṣads is only ignorance as distinct from knowledge possessed by the individual subject.[3] In Śaṁkara it becomes the logical way of thinking, which constitutes the finiteness of the human mind. It is not a nonentity like the son of a barren woman, since it appears and is experienced

[1] D.S.V., p. 302.
[2] Aham ajña ityādyanubhavāt. See *Vedāntasāra*, p. iv.
[3] See Chān. Up., i. 1. 10; Bṛh. Up., iv. 3. 20; iv. 4. 3.

by all of us; nor is it an entity, real and absolute, since it is destroyed by intuitional knowledge. If it were non-being, it could not produce anything; if it were being, what it produces must also be real and not phenomenal. "It is neither real nor phenomenal, nor is it both." [1] Though its origin and explanation are beyond our reach, the conditions of its operation through the mental categories are discernible. Whence comes this avidyā, the source of all ignorance, sin and misery? Avidyā cannot be the cause of individuality, for it cannot exist unless there are individuals. If it is the cause of individuality, it must exist independen of that, *i.e.* must belong to the one ultimate reality, Brahman. But avidyā cannot belong to Brahman, whose nature is one of eternal light repugnant to avidyā.[2] It cannot reside in Brahman, as Sarvajñātmamuni thinks; it cannot reside in the individual, as Vācaspati believes.[3] To say that Brahman modified is the seat of avidyā is useless, for the question is, how can Brahman be modified apart from avidyā? Rāmānuja urges that we have to assume a different avidyā for each soul, since, otherwise, the release of one soul will mean the release of all. It follows that avidyā takes account of the distinction of the souls, which it does not cause and therefore cannot explain. We have here circular reasoning.[4] Śaṁkara escapes from

[1] *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*, p. 3.

[2] "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John v; 2 Cor. vi. 14).

[3] See Śrīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī*, R.B., ii. 1. 15.

[4] R.B., ii. 1. 15; S.P.S., i. 21–24; v. 13–19, 54.

Pārthasārathi Miśra puts the objection thus: "Is this avidyā misapprehension or something else which causes misapprehension? If the former, whose (is this avidyā)? It cannot be Brahman's, whose nature is pure knowledge. In the sun there is no place for darkness. It cannot belong to the souls, since they are not distinct from Brahman. As avidyā cannot exist, no more can a second thing, the cause thereof. Besides, for those who regard misapprehension or cause of it as something additional to Brahman, non-duality vanishes. Whence arose Brahman's avidyā? There is no other, since Brahman is the sole entity. If it be said that it is natural to Brahman, how can ignorance be the nature of him whose nature is knowledge?" Kim bhrāntijñānam? kiṁ vā bhrāntijñānakāraṇabhūtaṁ vastvantaram? yadi bhrāntiḥ sā kasya? na brahmaṇas tasya svacchavidyārūpatvāt, na hi bhāskare timirasyāvakāśaḥ saṁbhavati; na jīvānām; teṣām brahmātirekeṇābhāvāt. Bhrāntyabhāvād eva ca, tatkāraṇabhūtaṁ vastvantaram apy anupapannam eva. Brahmātirekeṇa bhrāntijñānaṁ tatkāraṇaṁ cā'bhyupagacchatām advaitahāniḥ, kiṁkṛtā ca brahmaṇo 'vidyā, na hi kāraṇāntaram asti. Svābhāvikīti cet, katham

the difficulty by declaring avidyā to be inexplicable. The question is meaningless in Śaṁkara's metaphysics. We cannot make a transcendent use of an empirical category. We know that there is avidyā, and the question of its cause is meaningless, even as the question of the rise of finite spirits is. If we can understand the relation of Ātman to avidyā, we must be beyond the two.[1] Again, if avidyā were an essential property of the Ātman, the latter could never get rid of it; but the Ātman does not take in or part with anything whatsoever. It cannot belong to any finite being, whether he be God or man, since the latter must first be created in order that his avidyā may be possible. So his creation cannot be due to his or anyone else's avidyā. The individualisation of Brahman, the rise of finite spirits, cannot be due to the avidyā characteristic of finite life. It is an occurrence due to divine activity. But how avidyā and Brahman can coexist is just the problem for which we do not have any solution. Śaṁkara says: "We admit that Brahman is not the product of avidyā or is itself deluded, but we do not admit that there is another deluded conscious being (besides Brahman) which could be the producer of the ignorance."[2] According to *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka*, "Undifferenced absolute intelligence is the locus (āśraya) and object (viṣaya) of avidyā."[3] Deussen says: "In reality there is nothing else besides Brahman alone. If we

vidyāsvabhāvam avidyāsvabhāvaṁ syāt? (*Śāstradīpikā*, pp. 313–4; also p. 113).

Kumārila argues against the Advaita thus: "If Brahman is self-established and of pure form, there is nothing else beside it. What brings about the activity of avidyā which resembles a dream? If you say that some other causes it, or that it is different from Brahman, then non-dualism disappears; if it were its nature, then it can never be destroyed."

Svayaṁ ca śuddharūpatvād abhāvāc cānyavastunah
Svapnādivad avidyāyāḥ pravṛttis tasya kiṁkṛtā.
Anyenopaplave 'bhīṣte dvaitavādaḥ prasajyate
Svābhāvikīm avidyāṁ tu nocchettuṁ kiñcid arhati.
(S.V., *Saṁbandhākṣepaparihāra*, 84–85.)

[1] S.B.G., xiii. 2.

[2] S.B. on Bṛh., i. 4. 10. Lakṣmīdhara says in his *Advaitamakaranda*: "How should avidyā touch the self-illumined soul by whose light alone is caused the saying, 'I shine not'? Nevertheless, there does appear in the sky of consciousness some such mist as this, animated by absence of reflection and lasting till the sun of reflection arises" (16–17).

[3] i. 319. Āśrayatvaviṣayatvabhāginī nirvibhāgacitir eva kevalā.

imagine that we perceive a transformation (vikāra) of him into the world, a division (bheda) of him into a plurality of individuals, this depends on avidyā. But how does this happen? How do we manage to deceive ourselves into seeing a transformation and a plurality, where in reality Brahman alone is? On this question our authors give no information."[1] They give us no information, simply because "no information" is possible. Critics are ready with the remark: "In this system which maintains that everything transcends explanation, unreasonableness is no objection."[2] It is true that no explanation is possible of the rise of the bewildering force of avidyā, creator of false values, which has somehow come into phenomenal being in spite of the eternal and inalienable purity of the original self-existent Brahman.[3]

XXXII

Is the World an Illusion?

The doctrine of avidyā with its subjective note suggests a misleading view of the nature of the phenomenal world, that it is an illusion, a creation of the mind. Śaṁkara frequently traces the whole plurality of appearances, including that of Īśvara, to avidyā.[4] But the nature of Brahman is

[1] D.S.V., p. 302.

[2] Pārthasārathi Miśra. "Atrānirvacanīyavāde nā'nupapattir dūṣaṇam."

[3] The authors of *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka*, *Vivaraṇa*, *Vedāntamuktāvali*, *Advaitasiddhi* and *Advaitadīpikā* hold that avidyā has Brahman for its basis (āśraya) and object (viṣaya), even as darkness is in the house which it conceals. Vācaspati thinks that avidyā has for its basis jīva and object Brahman. According to the latter view, even Īśvara is the product of jīvā'jñāna, and there must be as many Īśvaras as there are jīvas. There is besides the theory of mutual dependence; the jīva depends on avidyā and avidyā on jīva. So it is said that avidyā has its locus in Brahman, which is not opposed to avidyā. The author of *Vidvanmanorañjanī* discusses this question, especially in view of the Advaita doctrine, that in deep dreamless sleep the individual soul is merged in Brahman; and holds if avidyā admittedly exists, then it can only reside in Brahman. See *Paṇḍit*, September 1872. The śuddhacaitanya is not the contradictory of avidyā, but only vṛtticaitanya. As Vidyāraṇya puts it, through the modification of the inner organ, which assumes the form of Ātman, the avidyā in the Ātman is sublated.

[4] Ekatvam . . . pāramārthikam mithyājñānavijṛmbhitaṁ ca nānātvam (S.B., ii. 1. 14).

not affected in any way, simply because our imperfect knowledge takes it to be so. The moon is not duplicated simply because those of defective vision see two moons. "The whole empirical reality, with its names and forms, which can be defined neither as being nor as non-being, rests upon avidyā; while in the sense of highest reality, Being persists without change or transformation. A change resting merely on words can alter nothing in the indivisibility of the real." [1] When confronted by the difficulties of creation and the finiteness of God, Śaṁkara says: "When by the teaching of non-separateness through sentences like 'That art thou,' the consciousness of non-separateness is awakened, then the wanderings of the soul and the creative function of God cease; for the whole tendency of the world to division springs from false knowledge and is removed by perfect knowledge. Whence then the creation? Whence the responsibility for not having brought forth the good only? For saṁsāra, which has as its characteristics the doing of good and evil, is a misconception produced by non-discrimination of the determination caused by avidyā, and consisting in the aggregate of the instruments of activity formed by names and forms; and this misconception, even like the attachment to division and separation by birth and death, does not exist in the absolute sense." [2] Again: "By that element of plurality which is the creation of avidyā characterised by name and form, which is evolved as well as non-evolved, which is not to be defined either as existing or non-existing, Brahman becomes the basis of this entire changing world, while in its true real nature it remains unchanged beyond the phenomenal universe." [3] This view, when exclusively emphasised, suggests that there is no plurality at all apart from the individual's avidyā. All change and motion, all growth and evolution, all science and speculation, are reduced to dreams, shadows and nothing more. The explanation of Brahman's causality of the world confirms the suspicion. In his anxiety to show that Brahman remains unaffected by the changes of the world,[4]

[1] Cp. S.B., ii. 1. 31; ii. 1. 14; ii. 3. 46; ii. 1. 27.

[2] Cp. also avidyākṛtaṁ kāryaprapañcam. The universe of effects is the product of avidyā (S.B., i. 3. 1).

[3] S.B., ii. 1. 27.

[4] S.B., ii. 1. 28; ii. 1. 9.

Śaṁkara says that the world is attributed[1] to Brahman as the snake to the rope. "A man may in the dark mistake a piece of rope for a snake and run away from it, frightened and trembling. Thereon another man may tell him, 'Be not afraid, it is only a rope, not a snake,' and he may then dismiss the fear caused by the imagined snake and stop running. But all the while the presence and the subsequent absence of his erroneous notion as to the rope being a snake make no difference whatever to the rope itself."[2] The stars do not actually twinkle, though they appear to do so. The light they project is quite steady, though the disturbances in the earth's atmosphere through which the light passes so affect our vision as to give them a constantly flickering appearance. Even so the semblance of variableness in Brahman is a fancy occasioned by our distorted vision.[3] Some of the illustrations used by Śaṁkara, when literally interpreted, suggest that all distinction and difference are but a mirage produced by human imagination. Differences are a make-believe of human thought which, like a prism, breaks up the pure unity into difference, where, in truth, the variety and the mind which knows it are both unreal. But it is a mistake to stress metaphors beyond what they are able to bear, and Śaṁkara urges that the illustrations used are intended only to suggest some points of resemblance and not perfect identity.[4]

Many later Advaitins have adopted a subjectivist interpretation of the world. Vācaspati is of opinion that avidyā belongs to the knowing subject, and, like a film over the eye, conceals the nature of the object.[5] Madhusūdana Sarasvatī holds that ignorance is the cause of this illusory world, and, by virtue of this ignorance, we regard Brahman as its material cause.[6] "The apparent universe has its root in the mind (citta) and does not persist when the mind (citta) is abolished."[7] *Citsukhī*, *Advaitasiddhāntamuktāvali* and *Yogavāśiṣṭha*

[1] Adhyāropitam.

[2] S.B., i. 4. 6. See also S.B. on *Kaṭha Up.*, iii. 14; iv. 11.

[3] S.B., ii. 3. 46.

[4] S.B., iii. 21. 17–19.

[5] Jīvāśrayam brahmaviṣayam. He thinks that the different forms imposed on Brahman are due to the modifications of the inner organ, and thus has to admit the existence of modifications and their objects.

[6] Asya daityendrajālasya yad upādānakāraṇam
Ajñānaṁ tad upāśritya brahma kāraṇam ucyate.
(*Advaitasiddhi*, p. 238).

[7] Cittamūlo vikalpo 'yam cittābhāve na kaścana (*Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*, p. 407).

make out a strong case for solipsism, and declare that our consciousness gives birth to the world, which sinks into non-being with the cessation consciousness.[1]

It is no wonder that the Western critics have adopted a similar view of the Advaita doctrine of the world. Edward Caird had in mind this interpretation of the world when he remarked: "The Brahman religion only rose to a pantheism which was an acosmism, to a unity which was no principle of order in the manifold differences of things, but merely a gulf in which all difference was lost."[2] As this view, which makes a tragic joke of life, renders meaningless many statements of Śaṁkara on the world of experience, and does violence to every canon of sound interpretation, we may here bring together certain considerations which support the phenomenal as against the illusory character of the world.

Avidyā by itself cannot be the cause of the world, since it is as dead as the pradhāna of the Sāṁkhya. Śaṁkara, who criticised the latter view, cannot be expected to support the theory of the creation of the world by avidyā. We have also to bear in mind Śaṁkara's criticism of the Buddhist chain of causation, which starts with avidyā. "Now avidyā is a mental fiction of a conscious subject. It is the first link in the twelve-linked chain of causation, which consequently must be regarded as taking for granted the aggregates of the mind and the body, without, however, showing how they come together."[3] Śaṁkara rejects the theory that nothing exists, neither matter nor mind (śūnyavāda),[4] as well as the

[1] See also S.S.S.S., xii. 17–19. Dṛṣṭisṛṣṭivāda, which holds that the world exists only so long as it is perceived, is upheld by *Yogavāśiṣṭha.*

> Manodṛśyam idaṁ sarvaṁ yat kiñcit sacarācaram,
> Manaso hy unmanībhāvād dvaitaṁ naivopalabhyate.

The whole world of movable and immovable things is the object of manas; by the suppression of it all duality ceases to be perceived. See the chapter on Jīvanmukti in *Yogavāśiṣṭhasāra*. Cp. also *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka*.

"Tava cittam ātmatamasā janitam parikalpayaty akhilam eva jagat." *Nṛsiṁhatāpanī Up.*, "cid dhīdam sarvam" (ii. 1. 7).

Tasmād vijñānam evāsti na prapañco na saṁsṛtiḥ (*Liṅga Purāṇa*, quoted in S.P.B., i. 42). It is these that justify the remark of Vijñānabhikṣu: "Etenādhunikānāṁ vedāntibruvāṇām api mataṁ vijñānavādatulyayogakṣematayā nirastam" (S.P.B., i. 43).

[2] *Evolution of Religion*, vol. i, p. 263. For other similar criticisms of Western writers see Kirtikar: *Studies in Vedanta*, ch. ii.

[3] S.B., ii. 2. 19.

[4] S.B., ii. 2. 31.

theory that nothing exists for more moments than one (kṣaṇabhaṅgavāda).[1] The refutation of the Buddhist theory of subjectivism (vijñānavāda) is decisive on the question of the externality of the world to the thinking subject. Existence is not dependent on our mental modes: when the world is said to be of the form of knowledge (jñānasvarūpa), the metaphysical truth is described. Similarly Śaṁkara rejects all attempts to reduce waking experience to the level of dreams.[2] He does not admit that the world is a product of mere avidyā. Avidyā in Śaṁkara is not a mere subjective force, but has an objective reality.[3] It is the cause of the whole material world (pṛthivyādiprapañca) which is common to all (sarvasādhāraṇa). Avidyā is positive in character, an objective force, beginningless[4] and existing both in a gross and subtle form.[5] Practically avidyā, māyā and prakṛti are identified.[6]

Śaṁkara argues that the supreme reality of Brahman is the basis of the world. If Brahman were absolutely different from the world, if the Ātman were absolutely different from the states of waking, dreaming and sleeping, then the repudiation of the reality of the world or the three states cannot lead us to the attainment of truth. We shall then have to embrace nihilism and treat all teaching as purposeless.[7] The illusory snake does not spring out of nothing, nor does it pass into nothing when the illusion is corrected. The root

[1] S.B., ii. 2. 18-21 and 26.

[2] Later Advaitins write as if there were no distinction between the two. Svayamprakāśa, in his commentary on Lakṣmīdhara's *Advaitamakaranda*, says: "As the world of dreams in me is projected by illusion, so is the waking world in me projected by illusion." See *Paṇḍit*, October 1873, p. 128.

[3] A famous verse quoted in *Siddhāntaratnamālā* urges that "the soul, God, pure consciousness, the distinctness of the first two, avidyā and its connection with pure consciousness—these our six are said to be without beginning."

> Jīva īśo viśuddhā cit vibhāgaś ca tayor dvayoḥ
> Avidyā taccitor yogaḥ ṣaḍ asmākam anādayaḥ.

[4]
> Anādibhāvarūpam yad vijñānena vilīyate
> Tad ajñānam iti prājñā lakṣaṇam sampracakṣate.
> (*Citsukhī*, i. 13).

[5] Ātmany avidyā sānādiḥ sthūlasūkṣmātmanā sthitā (S.S.S.S., xii. 19).

[6] Cp. Lokācārya: *Tattvatraya*, p. 48, Chowkhamba ed.

[7] Yadi hi tryavasthātmavilakṣaṇaṁ turīyam anyat, tatpratipattidvārābhāvāt śāstropadeśānarthakyam śūnyatāpattir vā (S.B. on *Māṇḍ. Up.*, ii. 7).

of the illusion is logical and psychological, and not metaphysical. The pluralistic universe is an error of judgment. Correction of the error means change of opinion. The rope appears as a snake, and when the illusion is over, the snake returns to the rope. So does the world of experience become transfigured in the intuition of Brahman. The world is not so much negated as reinterpreted. The conception of jīvanmukti, the idea of kramamukti, the distinction of values, of truth and error, of virtue and vice, the possibility of attaining mokṣa through the world of experience, imply that there is Reality in appearances; Brahman is in the world, though not as the world. If the world of experience were illusory and unrelated to Brahman, love, wisdom and asceticism could not prepare us for the higher life. In so far as Śaṁkara allows that we can realise the Absolute through the practice of virtue, he allows a significance to it. Unreal the world is, illusory it is not. The jīva is not a mere nonentity, for release is effected through the sublation only of the false self which is opposed to the nature of Ātman. As Vidyāraṇya says: " If the entire individual self were annihilated, release would not be beneficial to men."

If there were not a Brahman, then we could have neither empirical being nor illusion. As Śaṁkara says: " A barren woman cannot be said to give birth to a child either in reality or in illusion." [1] If the world be regarded as baseless, as not rooted in any reality, as having its origin in non-being, then we shall have to repudiate all reality, even that of Brahman.[2] The world has the real for its basis (āspadam), for " not even the mirage can exist without a basis." [3] That kind of dream which God creates, and of which God is the substance, is no dream at all.[4] If we are able to penetrate to the real through

[1] S.B. on Gauḍapāda's *Kārikā*, i. 6. See also iii. 28.

[2] Yadi hyasatām eva janma syād brahmaṇo 'sattvaprasaṅgaḥ.

[3] Na hi mṛgatṛṣṇikādayo 'pi nirāspadā bhavanti (S.B.G., xiii. 14). See also S.B. on Chān. Up., vi. 2. 3; Māṇḍūkya Up., i. 7.

[4] In later Advaita, the comparison of the world to a dream has been stretched to the breaking-point. *Advaitamakaranda* says: " In this protracted dream which the world is, projected in that great sleep of ignorance regarding the self, flash forth the glimpses of paradise, emancipation and so forth."

Ātmājñānamahānidrā jṛmbhite 'smiñ jaganmaye
Dīrghasvapne sphuranty ete svargamokṣādivibhramāḥ (18).

this world, it is because the world of appearance bears within it traces of the eternal. If the two are opposed, it will be difficult to regard them even in the relation of the real and the apparent. The world is not the Absolute, though based on it. What is based on the real, and is not the real itself, can only be called the appearance or phenomenon of the real. While the world is not the essential truth of Brahman, it is its phenomenal truth, the manner in which we are compelled to regard the real as it presents itself within our finite experience. But all this does not touch the question of the practical reality of the world.[1]

Śaṁkara's views on mokṣa confirm this view of the world. He urges that mokṣa does not mean the disappearance of the world, since then the world should have disappeared when the first case of mokṣa occurred. If mokṣa should involve the annihilation of plurality, the right way to go about realising it is not to displace avidyā by vidyā but to destroy the world.[2] Śaṁkara distinguishes jīvanmukti, or the state of release, while one is alive, from videhamukti, or the release obtained when the liberated shakes off his body. The presence of the body makes no difference to the state of release, which is in essence one of freedom from worldly bonds. The state of release consists not in the persistence or annihilation of plurality, but in the incapacity of the pluralistic universe to mislead us. For the jīvanmukta obviously the world of plurality, including his own body, does not perish; only he has the right perspective regarding it. In the state of release the world of plurality does not disappear, but is lit up by another light. There is no more the blindness born of desire, which sets and keeps the unhappy victims hunting in vain for what is not to be found in the chain of samsāra. The false ideas of the independence of selves and objects and their

[1] What Berkeley says in another connection holds good of Śaṁkara. "What therefore becomes of the sun, moon and stars? What must we think of houses, rivers, mountains, trees, stones, nay, even of our own bodies? Are all these but so many chimeras and illusions of the fancy? . . . I answer, that by the principles premised we are not deprived of any one thing in nature. Whatever we see, feel, hear, or any wise conceive or understand remains as secure as ever, and is as real as ever. There is a *rerum natura*, and the distinction between realities and chimeras retains its full force" (*Principles of Human Knowledge*, p. 34).

[2] S.B., iii 2. 21.

activities are undermined when the truth of the oneness of self with Brahman is realised.[1] Avidyā is not so much imagination as failure to discriminate (aviveka) between reality and appearance. Śaṁkara does not dispute the obvious fact that we seem to ourselves to be knowing, feeling, willing individuals, but denies the theory founded on these facts that the finite selves are real subjects being actually what they purport to be. The real accepts the phenomenal. Appearances belong to reality. This is the truth suggested by the hypothesis of ananyatva or non-difference, advocated by the Advaita. Rāmānuja criticises it thus: "Those, however, who maintain the non-difference of an effect from its cause, on the ground that the effect is unreal, cannot establish the non-difference they seek to make out, for there can be no identity between what is true and what is false. If it were as they maintain, either Brahman would be unreal or the world would be real."[2] The Advaitin does not maintain that Brahman devoid of all changes is, as such, one with the changing world. Nor does he suggest that the Brahman which sustains the changing world is as unreal as the latter. He holds that the phenomenal world is unreal, *i.e.* has no real existence apart from Brahman. The non-difference (ananyatva) is interpreted by Śaṁkara to be non-existence, as something different from its cause.[3] Vācaspati makes the meaning clear by making out in his *Bhāmatī* that non-difference does not affirm identity, but only denies difference.[4] Discussing the question of causality and its metaphysical truth of identity, Śaṁkara says that the effect is identical with the cause, and not the cause with the effect.[5] While Monism (ekatvam) may swallow up all distinctions and differences, in Advaitism (non-dualism) the gulf between the relative and the absolute is bridged over in a comprehensive

[1] Brahmātmadarśinam prati, samastasya kriyākārakaphalalakṣaṇasya vyavahārasyābhāvam (S.B., ii. 1. 14).

[2] R.B., ii. 1. 15; 1. 19.

[3] Tadvyatirekeṇābhāvaḥ (S.B., ii. 1. 14).

[4] Na khalv ananyatvam ity abhedam brūmaḥ kiṁ tu bhedaṁ vyāsedhāma (*Bhāmatī*, ii. 1. 14). In the same spirit the Ṭīkākāra says: "The world is not identical with Brahman, only it has no separate being apart from or independent of its underlying cause." "Kāraṇāt pṛthak sattāśūnyatvaṁ sādhyate, na tv aikyābhiprāyeṇa."

[5] S.B., ii. 1. 7.

affirmation. Śaṁkara's interpretation of the Upaniṣad passage, that the modifications of clay have for their reality clay, enforces the truth that the world is substantially Brahman and depends on it. Whenever he denies the reality of effects he qualifies his denial by some such phrase as "different from Brahman" or "different from the cause."[1] Nowhere does he say that our life is literally a dream and our knowledge a phantasm.

Since Śaṁkara repudiates the conception of a concrete universal as the ultimate category, it is thought that he dismisses the world as meaningless. Śaṁkara's Brahman, which has no other, nothing independent of it, seems to be an abstract unity, a sort of lion's den where all that enters is lost. Śaṁkara holds that we cannot construe the relation between Brahman and the world in any logical way, but he is as insistent as any advocate of the theory of the concrete universal that nothing is real apart from the ultimate reality. Though the world and Brahman are not regarded as complementary elements in a whole, they are not set in absolute antagonism. And yet great scholars have rushed to this conclusion.[2] Śaṁkara's view that the problem of the relation of reality and appearance remains for us finite souls a riddle, is the result of greater maturity of thought. We need not condemn human wisdom as illusory if it is unable to lift the veil which covers all ultimate beginnings.

The question is, are the appearances beyond which we have to penetrate to the truly real, actual states of the real, though possessing only a derivative and secondary sort of being, or are they simply the ideas with which the finite mind of man conceives the true reality in accordance with its own nature? In other words, is relative being a true modification of the original reality, or is it a distortion of the genuine being by the finite understanding of man? The former is the view of Rāmānuja, which is akin to the theory of Hegel, who regards

[1] Brahmavyatirekeṇa or Kāraṇavyatirekeṇa (S.B., ii. 2. 3, ii. 1. 14, and Gauḍapāda's *Kārikā*, i. 6).

[2] Deussen's interpretation is well known. Max Müller observes: "It must be clear to everyone who has once mastered the framework of the true Vedānta philosophy as I have here tried to explain it, that there is really but little room in it for psychology or cosmology, nay, even for ethics" (S.S.P., p. 170).

the relative world as a real self-expression of the .
One view of Spinoza's philosophy admits the positioı
latter view is represented by the Yogācāra Buddhist
like Kant and more thoroughly Schopenhauer, regaı
empirical world as a subjective appearance in consciou
shaped according to the categories of space, time and caus
among others. There are some passages in Śaṁkara which lead us to think that he tended to regard the world as a mere human presentation of the genuinely real, and others where he is inclined to make the world of experience objective and independent of the finite individual. To understand Śaṁkara's position, we should consider the relation of avidyā to māyā.

XXXIII

Māyā and Avidyā

When we look at the problem from the objective side, we speak of māyā, and when from the subjective side, we speak of avidyā.[2] Even as Brahman and Ātman are one, so are māyā and avidyā one. The tendency of the human mind to see what is really one as if it were many, is avidyā; but this is common to all individuals. For when Śaṁkara speaks of avidyā, he means neither yours nor mine. It is an impersonal force which imparts itself to our individual consciousnesses, though it transcends them. For our knowing mechanism operates on things already created, which we perceive but do not make. The world is created by God in the order mentioned in the scriptures and noticed by us.[3] Māyā is both subjective and objective, individual and universal, that out of which the conditioned forms of intelligence and of

[1] Pandit Kokileśvar Śāstri attributes a similar view to Śaṁkara. See his *Advaita Philosophy*.

[2] "We speak of māyā when we have in view its power of producing extraordinary effects and its being subject to the will of the agent; of avidyā, on the other hand, we speak when having in mind its obscuring power and its independence" (*Vivaraṇaprameyasaṁgraha*, i. 1; *Indian Thought*, vol. i, p. 280).

[3] Śrutidarśitena krameṇa parameśvareṇa sṛṣṭam, ajñātasattāyuktam eva viśvaṁ tadtadviṣayapramāṇāvataraṇe tasya tasya dṛṣtisiddhiḥ (*Siddhānta-leśa*, ii).

objective existence arise. If that by reason of which the unreal world presents itself as real is purely subjective, then it is mere fancy and cannot be seriously treated as the material cause of the world. If, on the other hand, it is regarded as the material cause of the world, something like the prakṛti of the Sāṁkhya, then it is not mere individual ignorance. The two, the avidyā of the individual and the prakṛti of the Brahman, arise together; neither of them is thinkable apart from the other, so that even avidyā is dependent on the ultimate reality.[1] The phenomenal self and the phenomenal world are mutually implicated facts.[2] Avidyā and prakṛti are co-eternal and belong to the world of experience.[3] The space-time-cause world is the view of reality given to us through avidyā, which is adapted to the purpose of presenting us with such a world. Śaṁkara steers clear of mentalism as well as materialism. We cannot say that nature is a phenomenon of our consciousness, any more than the phenomenal self is a product of nature. The conditions of the possibility of objective experience are also the conditions of the possibility of logical selfhood or self-consciousness. Why do our minds work in this misleading way? Why is there avidyā? Why do we have the space-time-cause world? Why is there māyā? are different ways of stating the same insoluble problem. The Ātman, which is pure knowledge, somehow lapses into avidyā, just as Brahman, which is pure being, turns aside into the space-time-cause world. Through avidyā we reach vidyā, even as through the empirical world we reach Brahman. Why there is this universal and primeval turning aside or perversion, is more than we can say, yet we must hold that neither our logical minds nor the world which it apprehends is an illusion. A phenomenon is not a phantasm. Avidyā and māyā represent the subjective and the objective sides of the one fundamental fact of experience. It is called avidyā, since it is dissolvable by knowledge; but the objective series is called māyā, since it is coeternal with the supreme person-

[1] Cp. Kant, also Bergson's view that the materiality of matter comes into existence with the intellectuality of our consciousness. Intellect and the world as it appears are born together and involve each other.

[2] Cp. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*: Avidyā pañcaparvaiṣā prādurbhūtā (i. 5. 5).

[3] *Advaitasiddhi*, p. 595.

ality. Śaṁkara admits its existence even in the state of pralaya or destruction. Īśvara, the omniscient, who controls his māyā, has no avidyā, and if Śaṁkara here and there lends countenance to a different theory, it is in the figurative sense that Īśvara has the power which leads to avidyā in the individual. The Sāṁkhya thinkers did not admit the existence of an Īśvara, but the empirical world was traced to a primeval avidyā which is said to be beginningless. Avidyā is a quality of buddhi, and therefore must reside in buddhi, and logic requires that the beginningless nature of avidyā must be attributed to its locus in buddhi also. So buddhi becomes a manifestation of prakṛti, the fundamental object or root-substance. The objectivity of avidyā is thus safeguarded. *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṁgraha* says: "Avidyā no doubt constitutes a defect in consciousness in so far as it impedes the presentation of non-duality and gives rise to the presentation of duality; but, on the other hand, it constitutes an excellence since it forms the material cause, and thus renders possible the cognition of Brahman."[1] The finiteness is necessary before we can reach the infinite.

While Śaṁkara uses avidyā and māyā indiscriminately,[2] later Advaitins draw a distinction between the two. While māyā is the

[1] *Indian Thought*, vol. ii, p. 177. Cp. Īśā Up., where we are said to cross death by means of avidyā.

[2] Colonel Jacob is against identifying māyā with avidyā. See *Vedāntasāra*, v. The world of plurality is the product of avidyā. The central forms of the finite mind, space, time and cause, are also the basis (ālambanam) of the phenomenal world. Avidyā is said to produce the māyā names and forms through which the empirical world is produced. Avidyāpratyupasthāpitanāmarūpamāyāveśavaśena (S.B., ii. 2. 2). It is sometimes said that mūlaprakṛti is māyā, while its effect of concealment (āvaraṇa) and projection (vikṣepa) are avidyā. Others are of opinion that mūlaprakṛti with pure sattva is māyā, while that qualified by impure sattva is avidyā. Vikṣepaśaktipradhāna-mūlaprakṛti, or the root substance dominated by the power of projection, is māyā, while āvaraṇaśaktipradhāna-mūlaprakṛti, or the root-substance dominated by the power of concealment, is avidyā. In some works on Advaita, avidyā is said to consist of the three qualities of sattva, rajas and tamas, and is said to constitute the upādhi of Īśvara. This view is not quite satisfactory. If Īśvara has the qualities of rajas and tamas, it is difficult to discriminate him from the jīva. Cp. *Skanda Purāṇa*, where avidyā is regarded as the limiting adjunct of jīva and māyā as the limiting adjunct of the Supreme viewed as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara.

Avidyopādhiko jīvo na māyopādhikaḥ khalu
Māyākāryaguṇacchannā brahmaviṣṇumaheśvarāḥ.

upādhi of Īśvara, avidyā is the upādhi of the individual. According to Vidyāraṇya, the reflection of Brahman in māyā which is made of the pure sattva is Īśvara, while the reflection of Brahman in avidyā, in which rajas and tamas are also present, is the jīva or the individual.[1] Śaṁkara is of this view, since he says: "The highest Brahman becomes the lower Īśvara through association with a pure limitation, when one conceives of it."[2] The products of avidyā are also the powers of Īśvara. The world is the expression of the nature of God; it is also relative to the logical mind of man. The things of the world are said to be both ideas of the Divine mind and presentations of human knowledge. Īśvara is asserted to be the cause of the world,[3] and yet the world belonging to the very self of Īśvara is also said to be fashioned by avidyā.[4] Brahman and māyā are present in the universe and constitute the material cause of the world. The two are entwined together into one string as the real and the appearance based on it.

XXXIV

The World of Nature

Śaṁkara does not stop with a mere description of reality, but examines the realm of phenomena in the light of his theory, formulates the truth which inadequate conceptions contain, and arranges the various phenomena in the order of their varying approximations to truth. He attempts to show how each appearance endeavours to reveal the character of reality which is its ground. Since the inexhaustible Brahman stands at the root of all, continuously higher and higher expressions reveal themselves in the world.[5] "As in the series of beings which descends from man to blades of grass, a successive diminution of knowledge, power and so on is observed—although they have all the common attribute of being animated—so in the ascending series, extending from man up to Hiraṇyagarbha, a gradually increasing manifes-

[1] *Pañcadaśī*, . 16–17.

[2] S.B., Chān. Up., iii. 14. 2. "Viśuddhopādhisaṁbandhāt."

[3] i. 1. 2.

[4] Cp. Avidyātmikā hi sā bījaśaktir avyaktaśabdanirdeśyā parameśvarāśrayā māyā (S.B., i. 4. 3). See also S.B., ii. 1. 14; i. 3. 19. Avidyayā māyayā.

[5] Yady apy eka evātmā sarvabhūteṣu sthāvarajaṅgameṣu gūḍhas tathāpi cittopādhiviśeṣatāratamyād ātmanaḥ kūṭasthanityasyaikarūpasyāpy uttarottaram āviṣṭasya tāratamyam aiśvaryaśaktiviśeṣaiḥ śrūyate (S.B., i. 1. 11).

tation of knowledge, power, etc., takes place."[1] We can distinguish in the world of phenomena: (1) the Īśvara, the dispenser of retribution, (2) the extension of nature, the nāmarūpaprapañca, the name and form world which is the scene of retribution, and (3) the plurality of individual souls, subject to the limitations of individuality, which suffer retribution in each new existence for the works of the previous lives. The plurality of the world arises from the two factors of the enjoyer and the enjoyed, the actors and the stage. The material world is called kṣetra, since it is the environment where the individual souls can act, realising their desires and fruits of their past karma.[2] It is inorganic nature consisting of the five elements. Organic nature consists of bodies in which souls that have entered into the elements and wander as plants, animals, men and gods are housed.[3] The world of saṁsāra consists of various orders of beings with different modes of existence and different worlds answering to conditions necessary for the fulfilment of the experiences of beings. These beings form a graduated scale where the lowest limit is constituted by those whose experiences are most limited and the highest being the gods of the supersensible realm.[4]

The evolution of the universe obeys an order.[5] From prakṛti, the element of objectivity, arises first ākāśa, the prius of space and matter. "The entire world springs from Īśvara, ākāśa being produced first, and later on the other elements in due succession."[6] Ākāśa, one, infinite, imponderable, inert, all-pervasive, is the first product.[7] It stands for both space and an exceedingly fine matter filling all space. However attenuated a substance ākāśa may be, it is yet of the same order as the elements of air, fire, water and earth. Thus Śaṁkara disputes the Buddhist view that ākāśa is a

[1] S.B., i. 3. 30. Yathā hi prāṇitvāviśeṣe 'pi manuṣyādistambaparyanteṣu jñānaiśvaryādipratibandhaḥ pareṇa pareṇa bhūyān bhavan dṛśyate, tathā manuṣyādiṣv eva hiraṇyagarbhaparyanteṣu jñānaiśvaryābhivyaktir api pareṇa pareṇa bhūyasī bhavati. See also S.B., i. 1. 1.

[2] Phalopabhogārtham . . . sarvaprāṇikarmaphalāśrayaḥ (S.B., Muṇḍ. Up., iii. 1. 1).

[3] The Vedic deities also belong to the cosmic process (S.B., i. 2. 17; i. 3. 33).

[4] S.B., i. 3. 10; S.B. on Bṛh. Up., i. 4. 10.

[5] S.B., ii. 1. 24–25.

[6] S.B., ii. 3. 7.

[7] S.B., i. 1. 22; i. 3. 41. See Chān. Up., iii. 14. 3; viii. 14.

negative entity, the mere absence of hindrances.[1] He holds that the negative result is a consequence of its positive nature.[2] From ākāśa other subtle elements (sūkṣmabhūtas) arise in an ascending order.[3] Following the account of the Upaniṣads,[4] Śaṁkara declares that, from ākāśa, air arises. From air comes fire, from fire water, from water earth. Since these five elements are relatively more permanent than their modifications, they are figuratively called immortal, imperishable.[5] Ākāśa has the quality of sound, air of impact and pressure, light of luminosity and heat, water of taste and earth of smell. The relation of the properties to the elements is one of seed to plant. The śabdatanmātra, or the sound-essence, gives rise to ākāśa, which, in its turn, produces the outer form of sound. The tanmātra or the essence, contains in it both the element and its property. We have seen also that there is a graduated scale of the elements. All of them seem to be contained in the ākāśa tanmātra. The whole world takes its rise from ākāśa or sound.

The gross matter of the world (mahābhūtas) is made up of the varying combinations of these subtle rudiments (sūkṣmabhūtas).[6] The gross substance ākāśa manifests sound, air manifests sound and pressure, fire these and in addition light and heat, water has the qualities of taste in addition to the others, and earth has the qualities of other substances and its own special quality of smell. Every object has the properties of sound, tangibility, form, taste and smell. While the subtle rudiments are forms, homogeneous and continuous, of matter without any atomicity of structure, the gross substances are composite, though they are also said to be continuous and devoid of atomic structure.[7] The gross elements

[1] Āvaraṇābhāva (S.B., ii. 2. 22).

[2] Vastubhūtam.

[3] S.B., ii. 3. 8–13.

[4] Tait. Up., ii. 1; Chān. Up., vi. 2. 2–3.

[5] Chān. Up., iv. 3. 1; Bṛh. Up., i. 5. 22.

[6] In each gross substance all the five subtle elements are found, though in different proportions. Quintuplication (pañcīkaraṇa) is the name given to the process of the combination of the five subtle elements into the gross substances of the world. Śaṁkara does not speak of pañcīkaraṇa, which assumes great importance in later Advaita. See *Vedāntasāra*. He adopts the view of trivṛtkaraṇa, or the mingling of the three elements. This is also the view of Vācaspati.

[7] Atom or aṇu is in the Advaita Vedānta not an ultimate indivisible discrete constituent of matter, but is the smallest conceivable quantum of matter.

give rise by modifications (pariṇāma) to different kinds of things. Matter is constantly undergoing change of state. Changes may also be induced from without. Śaṁkara speaks of a cosmic vibratory motion.[1] All these elements are non-intelligent (acetana), and cannot of themselves bring about their development. The immanence of God in them all is assumed.[2] If the activities of the different elements are sometimes traced to the different Vedic deities, it makes little difference, since the latter only symbolise the functions of Īśvara.

The order of creation is reversed in the case of dissolution.[3] At the time of dissolution the earth becomes water again; water fire, fire air, air becomes ākāśa, and ākāśa re-enters Īśvara.

The psychic organs like manas (inner organ) are assumed by Śaṁkara to be of like nature with the physical elements. The human organism, like other things, is composed of the three elements of earth, water and fire.[4] Manas or the inner organ, prāṇa or the vital breath, and vāk or speech, correspond to earth, water and fire respectively.[5] Śaṁkara is aware that they are sometimes regarded as different in kind from the physical elements and produced before or after them. In any case they, as well as the elements, are in themselves lifeless and are produced as means to ends. Inorganic nature is parārtha, *i.e.* serves a purpose which lies beyond it.[6] There is uniformity of nature in the inorganic world.[7]

When we pass to organic nature, a new principle comes before us, the power of life immanent in certain things, by

[1] Sarvalokaparispandanam.

[2] Parameśvara eva tena tenātmanāvatiṣṭhamāno 'bhidhyāyaṁs taṁ taṁ vikāraṁ sṛjati (S.B., ii. 3. 13). Rāmānuja holds that God's saṁkalpa, or will, is not necessary on every occasion of change. It occurs only once before the rise of ākāśa.

[3] See S.B., ii. 3. 14. Cp. Deussen: " This view is likely to throw some light on the scientific motive of the teaching of the gradual evolution and absorption of the elements, as to which we have no other information; the observation that solids dissolve in water, that water turns into steam through heat, that the flames of fire flicker out into the air, air according to the altitude rarefies more and more into empty space, might lead us to the gradual progression of the dissolution of the world, and, by inversion into its opposite, the creation of the world " (D.S.V., p. 237).

[4] Chān. Up., vi. 2. 2–3.

[5] S.B., ii. 4. 20; iii. 1. 2.

[6] S.B.G., xiii. 22.

[7] S.B., Tait. Up., ii. 8.

which they are able to realise a state of greater perfection, the power of realising an ideal. A stone does not live, since it has no tendency to become perfect, no inward inclination or strength to turn itself into a pillar or a statue. A plant, however, lives. If placed in suitable conditions, it has the power to grow, put forth leaf and blossom, flower and fruit. The animal, again, is capable of a fuller life than the plant. It sees, hears and feels, and also knows vaguely what it is about. Not only does it thrive in favourable conditions, but it goes out to find those conditions. It moves on purpose, while the plant does not. The human being lives a much higher life. He is what Śaṁkara calls a vyutpannacitta, a reflective being, with understanding and will. He has the growing power of the plant, the moving and the sensing powers of the animal, as well as the power to pierce behind the veil, discriminate the eternal from the non-eternal, and choose between good and evil. Men who realise their ambition are the gods. Thus under organic nature we find four classes of beings, gods, men, animals and plants.[1] In the spirit of the Upaniṣads, Śaṁkara admits that plants are places of enjoyment and possess living souls,[2] which have entered into them in consequence of impure deeds. Though they are insensible of enjoyment and suffering, they are said to be atoning for the deeds of their past existence. For Śaṁkara generally recognises three kinds of embodied souls, gods to whom is assigned a condition of infinite enjoyment, men whose lot is a mixed one of happiness and misery, and animals whose share is infinite suffering.[3] In their embodied condition the souls exist together with the vital forces and subtle bodies, and, until they are liberated, these cling to them. The souls are said to be emanations from Brahman as the sparks are from fire; only they return into Brahman, while the sparks do not get back to fire.[4]

[1] S.B., iii. 1. 24. [2] *Ibid.* [3] S.B., ii. 1. 34.
[4] Muṇḍ. Up., ii. 1. 1; Kauṣītaki, iii. 3. 4. 20; Bṛh., ii. 1. 20. See S.B., iii. 1. 20–21; Ait. Up., iii. 3. See also Chān. Up., vi. 2. 2.

XXXV

The Individual Self

The aim of the Vedānta is to lead us from an analysis of the human self to the reality of the one absolute self. The passages of the Vedānta possess this dual application.[1] The individual self is a system of memories and associations, desires and dislikes, of preferences and purposes. Though it may not be possible for us to take in at a single glance this whole system, its general structure and predominant elements are open to our inspection. This system is the vijñānātman, which is subject to change, while the paramātman is free from all change.[2] The jīva is said to be in essence one with the Ātman. That art thou.[3] " Nor is there any force in the objection that things with contrary qualities cannot be identical; for the opposition of qualities can be shown to be false." [4] Śaṁkara distinguishes carefully the self that is implied in all experience from the self which is an observed fact of introspection, the metaphysical subject or the " I " and the psychological subject or the " me." The object of self-consciousness (ahampratyayaviṣaya) is not the pure self, the sākṣin, but the active and enjoying individual (kartṛ) endowed with objective qualities. When the psychologists speak of self, they treat it as an object of introspection. While the Ātman is purely cognitive,[5] our individual consciousness is essentially an active striving towards some end. The sense of activity is for each of us our most intimate experience. This empirical self is the agent of all activities.[6] If activity (kartṛtva) were the essential nature of the soul, there would be no delivery from it—any more than of fire from heat—and as long as man has not freed himself from activity, he has failed to attain his highest end, since activity is essentially painful. " The activity of the soul depends only

[1] S.B., ii. 3. 25.

[2] S.B., i. 3. 24. Cp. also Kaṭha Up., iii. 1; Muṇḍ., iii. 1. 1; Śvet. Up., iv. 6. 7.

[3] Cp. with this the well-known doctrine of the Quakers, according to which there is in every man's inmost being the Inner Light, the radiance by which all dogmas and doctrines are to be judged.

[4] S.B., iv. 1. 3. [5] S.B., ii. 3. 40. [6] S.B., i. 1. 4.

on the qualities of the upādhis being ascribed to it and not to its own nature."[1] The individual soul is essentially an agent; otherwise the Vedic injunctions, etc., would become purposeless. There are many passages in the Upaniṣads which attribute agency to the soul.[2] Agency really abides in the upādhi or limitation, of vijñāna or understanding. The jīva is subject-object, self and not-self, reality and appearance. It consists of the Ātman limited or individuated by the object.[3] It is the Ātman in association with ajñāna. In Emerson's language, "Every man is God playing the fool."[4] Avidyā or logical knowledge, causes the sense of individuality of the empirical self, which is "alike deceiving and deceived." The distinctive characteristic of the individual soul is its connection with buddhi or understanding, which endures as long as the state of saṁsāra is not terminated by perfect knowledge.[5] The soul's connection with buddhi continues even after death. It can be broken only by the attainment of freedom. During deep sleep and death this connection is potential, while it becomes actual on waking and rebirth respectively. If we do not assume a potential continuance of this kind, the law of causality will be violated, since nothing can arise without a given cause.[6]

The psychophysical organism consists of the organic body,[7] made up of the gross elements, which the soul casts off at

[1] S.B., ii. 3. 40. Tasmād upādhidharmādhyāsenaivātmanaḥ kartṛtvaṁ na svābhāvikam. See also S.B. on Kaṭha Up., iii. 4.

Both the Advaita and the Sāṁkhya regard the Ātman or puruṣa as unconditioned by the activities of the doer. It is regarded as the doer when confused with the limits of individuality. This confusion or non-discrimination is the work of avidyā in Advaita and prakṛti in Sāṁkhya.

[2] Bṛh. Up., iv. 3. 12; Tait., iii. 5. See also S.B., ii. 3. 33.

[3] S.B., ii. 3. 40.

[4] Sureśvara compares the jīva to a prince carried away by a cowherd and brought up in rural associations. When he became acquainted with his royal descent he gave up his other occupations and realised his kingly nature.

Rājasūnoḥ smṛtiprāptau vyādhabhāvo nivartate
Yathaivam ātmano 'jñasya tat tvam asy ādivākyataḥ.

(S.L.S.) See also S.B. Bṛh. Up., ii. 1. 20; Suresvara's *Vārttika* on Bṛh. Up., ii. 1. 507–516.

[5] S.B., ii. 3. 20.

[6] It is said that the souls connected with buddhi reside in Īśvara when the connection is potential, though it is also urged that the souls at death and deep sleep enter into Brahman itself (Chān. Up., vi. 8; S.B., ii. 3. 31).

[7] Deha, sthūlaśarīra, annamayakośa.

death, the life organs (prāṇas)[1] and the subtle body,[2] made up of the subtle portions of the elements which compose the seed of the body.[3] The subtle body[4] consists of the seventeen elements, *viz.*, five organs of perception, five of action, five vital forms, mind and intellect.[5] This subtle body, while material, is also transparent, and so is not seen when the jīva migrates. While the subtle body and the vital forms persist as permanent factors of the soul until liberation, there is the varying factor of moral determination (karmāśraya), which accompanies the soul in each life as a new form not previously existing.[6] The basis of individuality is to be found, not in the Ātman or the upādhis, but in moral determination, which is a complex of knowledge (vidyā), works (karma), and experience (prajñā).[7] The vital forces continue to exist, like the subtle body which carries them, as long as saṁsāra endures, and accompany the soul inseparably even if it should enter a plant, in which case the internal organ and the senses cannot naturally unfold themselves. As saṁsāra is beginningless, the soul must have been equipped with this apparatus of vital forms from eternity. A third, kāraṇa-śarīra, is sometimes mentioned and identified with the beginningless indefinable avidyā. The causal self (kāraṇa-ātmā) is the relatively permanent human self, which persists through successive rebirths determined by the law of karma. This account of the psychological organism is identical with that of the Sāṁkhya, except in the matter of the five vital forces.

The five organs of perception, the five of action and manas are created objects,[8] minute (aṇu or sūkṣma) and limited (paricchinna). They are not of atomic size (paramāṇutulya), since

[1] The life organs are of two kinds: those of the conscious life, as the five organs of sense (buddhīndriyāṇi), five of action (karmendriyāṇi), and manas, which controls perception and action; those of the unconscious life. The mukhyaprāṇa, which is the chief breath of life, is divided into five different prāṇas, subserving the different functions of respiration, nutrition, etc. Though having a limited size, it is invisible (S.B., i. 4. 13).

[2] Sūkṣmaśarīra, liṅgaśarīra, bhūtāśraya.

[3] Dehabījāni, bhūtasūkṣmāṇi.

[4] It corresponds to the liṅgaśarīra of the Sāṁkhya.

[5] Kartṛtvabhoktṛtvaviśiṣṭajīvo manomayādipañcakośaviśiṣṭaḥ. Its elements are determined by mechanical causality. See S.B., Bṛh. Up. i. 4. 17.

[6] S.B., ii. 4. 8–12; D.S.V., pp. 325–6.

[7] See Bṛh. Up., iv. 4. 2.

[8] S.B., ii. 4. 1–4.

their pervading the whole body would then be unintelligible. They are regarded as subtle, since, if they were gross, they could be seen passing at death. They are of limited size and not infinite, since in the latter case there can be no passing or going or returning for them. Śaṁkara, in this whole account, has in view the sense-functions and not their material counterparts. The senses are not all-pervading, but are of the same extent as the bodily regions where they function.[1] The several organs are, as usual, traced to the different elements,[2] and the gods who control the elements are said to control the organs as well. The mukhyaprāṇa is the supporting and animating principle of life. Even the psychical apparatus depends on it. The senses are sustained by the mukhyaprāṇa, and so are called prāṇas.[3] The Ātman clothed in the upādhis is the jīva, which enjoys and suffers (bhoktṛ) and acts (kartṛ), from both of which conditions the highest soul is free.[4]

The jīva rules the body and the senses, and is connected with the fruits of actions. Since its essence is the Ātman, it is said to be vibhu or all-pervading, and not aṇu or of atomic size. If it were the latter, it could not experience the sensations extending over the whole body.[5]

Those who hold that the soul is atomic argue that an infinite soul cannot move, whereas it is seen to leave one body and return to another. This passage, according to Śaṁkara, does not touch the soul as such but only its limitations.[6] The objection that if the soul be atomic, it can only be in one place in the body, and so cannot perceive throughout the body, is set aside by the example that even as a piece of sandal-wood refreshes the body all over, even though it touches the body only at one spot, so the atomic soul can feel throughout the body by means of the sense of touch which pervades the whole

[1] ii. 4. 8. 13.

[2] S.B., ii. 4. 14–16; Bṛh. Up., i. 3. 11; iii. 2. 13; Ait Up., i. 2. 4.

[3] ii. 4. 1–6.

[4] Param brahma . . . apahatapāpmatvādidharmakam, tad eva jīvasya paramārthikaṁ svarūpam . . . itarad upādhikalpitam (S.B., i. 3. 19). Plato has a similar view, which he illustrates by the striking simile of Glaucus plunging into the depths of the sea. If we see him there, we fail to recognise him, for he is so overgrown with seaweeds, mussels and other creatures of the deep. Each individual soul is a lost soul, and we cannot recognise its true nature until we recover it from the ocean of saṁsāra and strip it of its overgrowth of weeds, shells and slime.

[5] S.B., ii. 3. 29.

[6] *Ibid.*

body. Śaṁkara refutes the suggestion by urging that the thorn on which one treads is also connected with the whole sense of feeling, though the pain is felt only on the sole of the foot and not on the whole body. The advocates of the atomic view suggest that the atomic soul pervades the whole body by means of the quality of spirit or caitanya, even as the light of a lamp placed in one spot extends from there to the whole room. Śaṁkara declares that quality cannot extend beyond substance. The flame of a lamp and its light are not related as substance and quality. Both are fiery substances; only in the flame the parts are drawn closer together, while in the light they are more widely separated. If the quality of caitanya or spirit, pervades the whole body, then the soul cannot be atomic. The passages of the Upaniṣads which refer to the soul as aṇu [1] have in view not the Ātman but the nucleus of the qualities of understanding and mind. They are intended to show the subtlety of the Ātman which escapes perception.[2] It is admitted that the empirical self, bound down by manas, etc., is not infinite, while the supreme reality is infinite.[3] If it is said to be atomic, it is because empirically it is associated with buddhi.[4] All the statements about the soul's abiding in the heart are due to the theory of the location of the buddhi in it. Again, what is everywhere can certainly be in one place, though what is confined to a place cannot be everywhere.[5] In this way Śaṁkara explains all the passages of the Upaniṣads, which assert a spatial limitation of the soul.[6] The whole life of religious obligation is founded on the relative reality of the empirical ego. The entire field of practical existence, with its scheme of merit and guilt, its body of sacred law, with its commands and prohibitions, its prospects of happiness in heaven and suffering in hell, all assume the identification with the self of the body, the senses and the variety of conditions surrounding it. In all the successions of life it is not the Ātman, but the shadow of it, that grieves and complains and acts out the plot on the world-stage. The soul, until its separation from the upādhis, is subject to pleasure, pain and individual consciousness.[7]

Śaṁkara gives an account of the different states of the soul. In the waking condition, the whole perceptual mechanism is operative, and we apprehend objects by means of the mind and the senses. In dream states, the senses are at rest and only the manas is active. Through the impressions left on the senses by the waking condition, it knows objects. The dreaming self is not the ultimate spirit, but the same limited by adjuncts. That is why we are not able to create

[1] Muṇḍ. Up., iii. 19; Śvet., v. 8–9.
[2] S.B., ii. 3. 29.
[3] See S.B., ii. 3. 19–32.
[4] ii. 3. 29.
[5] S.B., ii. 1. 7; ii. 3. 49.
[6] See S.B., i. 3. 14–18 i. 2. 11–12.
[7] Viśeṣavijñāna.

at will in a dream. If we could do so, no one would have an unpleasant dream.[1] In the state of deep sleep, the mind and the senses are at rest, and the soul is, as it were, dissolved in its own self and regains its true nature. Śaṁkara mentions continuity of karma as an argument for the continuity of self. There is also remembrance. Consciousness of personal identity (ātmānusmaraṇa) proves that the same soul awakes as went to sleep. Scripture affirms it, and would lose its meaning if deep sleep disturbed the continuity of the self. If one goes to sleep as A and wakes up as B, there will be no continuity of acts. Even the liberated might awake. Evidently even in deep sleep, as at death, the nucleus of individuality is kept up. In spite of loose statements to the contrary, it is admitted that even in deep sleep the upādhi, which limits the jīva to samsāra, exists potentially. If, in deep sleep as in liberation, there is an entire absence of special cognition, how and in what does the sleeping person retain the seed of avidyā on account of which waking takes place? Śaṁkara draws a distinction between the temporary union with Brahman in deep sleep and the permanent one in mokṣa. "In the case of deep sleep, the limiting upādhi exists, so that when it starts up into being, the jīva must start up into existence." [2] In the state of mokṣa, the seeds of avidyā are all burnt up.[3]

The state of swoon is given a separate place, since it is different from waking, inasmuch as the senses no longer perceive objects. This indifference to the object world is not the result of concentration of attention on other objects. It is different from dreams since there is not any accompanying consciousness, from death since there is life in the body, and from dreamless sleep since there is unrest in the body. A fainting person cannot be roused so easily as a sleeping one. The state of swoon is said to be intermediate between deep sleep and death. "It belongs to death in so far as it is the door of death. If there remains any (unrequited) work of the soul, speech and mind return to the senseless person; if no work remains, breath and warmth depart from him." [4]

Each man is in essence the supreme reality, unchanging and unmodified and partless, and yet we speak of the rise

[1] S.B., iii. 2. 6.
[2] S.B., iii. 2. 9.
[3] See S.B. on Gauḍapāda's *Kārikā*, iii. 14.
[4] S.B., iii. 2. 10.

and growth of the soul. For when the adjuncts are produced or dissolved, the self is said to be produced or dissolved.[1] The limiting adjuncts give individuality to the different souls of the world.[2] They determine the nature of the body, the caste of the jīva, the duration of life, etc.[3] The souls are different on account of these adjuncts, and there is no confusion of actions or fruits of actions.[4] Even if the individual soul is regarded as an ābhāsa or reflection only, like that of the sun in water, the individuality of the souls is not prejudiced.[5]

XXXVI

Sākṣin and Jīva

In each individual self we have, besides the cognitive, emotional and conative experience, the witness self or sākṣin. The eternal consciousness is called the sākṣin when the internal organ serves as the limiting adjunct to it and when it illumines objects. The presence of this adjunct is enough to transform the ultimate consciousness into the witness self. Though this witnessing consciousness arises with the experience of objects, it is not due to the experience, but is presupposed by it. When the internal organ enters into the individual and becomes an organic constituent thereof, we have the jīva.

What is the relation between the witness self and the jīva? In the later Advaita treatises it has been variously defined. Vidyāraṇya defines the witness self as the unchanging consciousness, which is the substratum of the phenomena of gross and subtle bodies, observing their effects without being affected by them in any way.[6] When the action of the enjoying ego ceases, the illumination of the two bodies

[1] S.B., ii. 3. 17.
[2] S.B., iii. 2. 9.
[3] Sureśvara's *Vārttika*, pp. 110–113.
[4] S.B., ii. 3. 49.
[5] " As when one reflected image of the sun trembles, another reflected image does not on that account tremble also, so when one soul is connected with actions and results of actions, another soul is not on that account connected likewise. There is therefore no confusion of actions and results " (S.B., ii. 3. 50).
[6] *Pañcadaśī*, viii. *Siddhāntaleśa* (ch. i) describes Vidyāraṇya's view thus: " Dehadvayādhiṣṭhānabhūtaṁ kūṭasthacaitanyaṁ svāvacchedakasya dehadvayasya sākṣād īkṣaṇān nirvikāratvāt sākṣīty ucyate."

is due to this witness self. This witness self is immediately conscious of the two kinds of bodies which are present to it as its associates, even when the enjoying ego ceases to function. The constant presence of the witness self helps to maintain the identity of the seer in a series of mental ideas with respect to something other than the ego. Vidyāraṇya is clear that the witness self cannot be identified with the jīva which participates in life and affairs. The Upaniṣad declares it to be one without qualities, a mere looker on and not an enjoyer of fruits.[1] Vidyāraṇya compares it, in another place, to the lamp on the stage which illumines equally the stage manager, the actress and the audience, and shines of itself even in their absence.[2] This simile is to point out that the witness self illumines equally the empirical ego (jīva), the inner organ and the objects, and shines of its own accord in sound sleep where all these are absent.[3] Passivity distinguishes the sākṣin from Īśvara. In the *Tattvapradīpikā*, the witness self is defined as the pure Brahman, which is the universal self of all creatures, and which, being the substratum of each individual soul, seems to be as many as the jīvas. The witness self cannot be identified with the qualified Brahman or Īśvara, since it is defined as absolute, devoid of qualities; nor is the witness to be identified with the jīva, who is a doer and enjoyer of actions and their fruits.[4] The view advocated in *Pañcadaśī* and *Tattvapradīpikā* has the support of Śaṁkara.

Kaumudī teaches that the witness self is a special form of Īśvara. The author of this treatise takes his stand on the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* passage which makes Īśvara the witness. While he is conscious of the jīva's activity and cessation from activity, he is in no way moved by them.[5] He operates in the jīva, illumining his avidyā and all else pertaining to him. He is known as prājña, when all activities are withdrawn as in the state of dreamless sleep.[6] The author of *Tattvaśuddhi* agrees with this view. That Īśvara is the sākṣī, is the religious or empirical way of describing the first view. We find support for it in Śaṁkara's writings. Commenting on the famous passage [7] of the Upaniṣad which describes the two birds perched on the same tree, Śaṁkara writes: "Of these two so perched, one, the ksetrajña, occupying the subtle body, eats (*i.e.* tastes) from ignorance the fruits of karma marked as happiness and misery, palatable in many and diversified modes; the other, the Lord eternal, pure, intelligent and free in his nature, omniscient and conditioned by sattva, does not eat;

[1] Cp. "Sākṣī, cetā, kevalo, nirguṇaś ca" (Śvet. Up.).

[2] 'Nṛtyaśālāsthito dīpaḥ prabhuṁ sabhyāṁś ca nartakīm
Dīpayed aviśeṣeṇa tadabhāve 'pi dīpyate." (*Pañcadaśī*, x. 11.)

[3] *Ibid.*, x. 12.

[4] Tattvapradīpikāyām api, māyāśabalite, saguṇe parameśvare, 'kevalo nirguṇa" iti viśeṣaṇānupapatteḥ sarvapratyagbhūtam, viśuddham brahma, jīvād bhedena, sākṣīti pratipādyata ity uditam (*Siddhāntaleśa*, i).

[5] Parameśvarasyaiva rūpabhedaḥ kaścit jīvapravṛttinivṛttyor anumantā svayam udāsīnaḥ sākṣī nāma (*Siddhāntaleśa*, i).

[6] See V.S., i. 3. 42.

[7] Muṇḍ. Up., iii. 1. 1.

for he is the director of both the eater and the eaten." 'His mere witnessing is as good as direction, as in the case of a king." [1]

Some others maintain that the jīva conditioned by avidyā is the witness self, since he is essentially a looker on and not a doer. It is only when he falsely identifies himself with the inner organ that he becomes the doer and the enjoyer.[2] Jīva has thus two aspects, one real and the other unreal, that of sākṣin or passive spectator, and abhimānin or active doer and enjoyer. It is objected to this view that if the all-pervading avidyā is to be regarded as the condition of the witnessing jīva, then the latter must be able to illumine not only one's own mind but the minds of other creatures also. But this is not confirmed by experience. So the jīva, with the antaḥkaraṇa or the inner organ, as its condition, is the witness self, and this is different in different individuals. In suṣupti (dreamless sleep) it is supposed to exist in a subtle form, and so is present in all the three states. The difference between the empirical ego and the witness self is that, while the inner organ is an attribute or property of the former, it is only a condition or limitation of the latter.[3] This is the view of the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, and is not in conflict with the other views set forth, since it points out that the ultimate consciousness, when it operates in an individual subject, is called sākṣin. The eternal consciousness or Ātman, is given the name of jīvasākṣi when it operates in the individual organism, as it is called Īśvarasākṣi when it operates in the universe as a whole. The limitations or upādhis in the two cases justify the different names. In the former, the upādhi is the internal organ, body, etc., in the latter the whole world of being. Īśvara is the world-soul, while the jīva is the individual soul.

XXXVII

Ātman and Jīva

We cannot attribute substantiality or simplicity to the individual ego. It is not an atomic unit, but a very complex structure. It is the systematic unity of the conscious experiences of a particular individual centre, which is itself defined or determined at the outset by the bodily organism and other conditions. The body, the senses, etc., enter into its experi-

[1] Paśyaty eva kevalaṁ darśanamātreṇa hi tasya prerayitṛtvaṁ rājavat (S.B., Muṇḍ., iii. 1. 1).

[2] Kecid avidyopādhiko jīva eva sākṣād draṣṭṛtvāt sākṣī; jīvasyāntaḥkaraṇatādātmyāpatyā kartṛtvādyāropabhāk tv epi svayam udāsīnatvāt (*Siddhāntaleśa*, i).

[3] Antaḥkaraṇopadhānena jīvaḥ sākṣī . . . antaḥkaraṇaviśiṣṭaḥ pramātā (*Siddhāntaleśa*, i).

ence and introduce a sort of unity and continuity into it. The consciousness linked up with the organism is a purely finite one, which includes bodily states as part of the content of consciousness. As the body is built up gradually, so also is its conscious experience. The finite self is not the ultimate cause of its own consciousness. The ego is the felt unity of the empirical consciousness, which is evolving in time. It is an ideal construction or an object of conceptual thinking.[1] It is shifting in the same individual, and therefore cannot be identified with the unchanging and unchangeable essence. The Ātman, which is the underlying basis of empirical egos, suffers no change and experiences no emotions.

Inconceivable though it is, the Ātman has nothing to do with the individual's life history, which it so faithfully attends and accompanies. Assumed as the constant witness, the Ātman serves merely as the screen or the basis on which mental facts play. We cannot say that they grow out of it, for the real is not affected by what is confused with it. Things do not alter their nature simply because we do not rightly understand them. How does the unchanging Ātman appear as limited, how can the eternal light of intelligence be darkened by any agency whatever, since it is free from all relations? It is the old question How does the real become the phenomenal? It is the relation of Ātman to the upādhis of body, senses, mind and sense-objects that accounts for its phenomenal character; but this relation between the Ātman and the psychological self is inexplicable, māyā, or mysterious. If Ātman is eternal freedom and pure consciousness, and wants nothing and does nothing, how can it be the source of movement and desire in the embodied self? "A thing, it is answered, which is itself devoid of motion may nevertheless move other things. The magnet is itself devoid of motion, and yet it moves iron."[2] When we speak about the relation of the finite selves to the infinite Ātman, we are at the mercy of the finite categories, which do not strictly apply.

Saṁkara discusses the different views of the relation between the individual soul and Brahman, mentioned in the *Brahma Sūtra*, such

[1] Cp. Ward: *Psychological Principles*, pp. 361–382.
[2] S.B., ii. 2. 2.

as those of Āśmarathya, Auḍulomi and Kāśakṛtsna. Āśmarathya takes his stand on the Upaniṣad texts which compare the relation of individuals to the Absolute to that of sparks and fire. As the sparks issuing from a fire are not absolutely different from the fire, since they participate in the nature of fire and, on the other hand, are not absolutely non-different, since in that case they would not be distinguishable either from the fire or from each other; so the individual souls are neither different from the supreme reality, for that would mean they are not of the nature of intelligence, nor absolutely non-different from it, since, then, they would not be different from each other. So Āśmarathya concludes that the individuals are both different and non-different from Brahman.[1] Auḍulomi's view is that the individual soul, bound by the limiting adjuncts of body, senses, and mind, is different from Brahman, though, through knowledge and meditation, it passes out of the body and becomes one with the highest self. He admits the absolute distinction between the unfreed individual self and Brahman and the absolute identity of the freed with Brahman.[2] Śaṁkara accepts the view of Kāśakṛtsna.[3]

The individual ego cannot be a part of the absolute spirit, as Rāmānuja thinks, since the Absolute is without parts, being beyond space and time. It cannot be different from the Absolute, as Madhva supposes, since there is nothing different from the Absolute, which is one without a second.[4] It cannot be a modification of the Absolute, as Vallabha thinks, since the Absolute is unchangeable. We cannot regard the individual soul as the creation of God, since the Vedas which speak of the creation of fire and other elements do not speak of the creation of the soul. Jīva is neither different from nor a part of nor a modification of the absolute Ātman. It is the Ātman itself. We do not realise its nature, since it is covered by the upādhis.[5] Unless it were one with the supreme self, the statements of the scriptures proving immortality would become meaningless. Referring to the teaching of Āśmarathya, Śaṁkara says: "If the individual soul were different from the highest self, the knowledge of the highest self would not imply the knowledge of the individual soul, and thus the promise given in one of the Upaniṣads, that, through the knowledge of one reality, everything is known, would not be fulfilled."[6] Commenting on the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, Śaṁkara writes: "It is not possible that one can ever attain identity with another altogether distinct,"[7] and as the Upaniṣads speak of the knower of the Brahman becoming Brahman, the knower must be one with Brahman.

The metaphysical identity between the supreme Ātman and the individual jīva may be allowed; but it does not

[1] S.B., i. 4. 20. [2] S.B., i. 4. 21. [3] S.B., i. 4. 22.
[4] S.B., iv. 3. 14.
[5] See S.B. on Muṇḍ. Up., ii. 2. 1; Kaṭha Up., ii. 2. 1.
[6] S.B., i. 4. 20. [7] S.B. on Tait. Up., ii. 8. 15.

touch the question of the relation of the supreme to the latter, before it has arrived at a knowledge of its true nature. Our empirical egos move, weighted down by the burdens of the upādhis.[1] Knowing that the relation between the Absolute and the individual self is incapable of logical articulation, still Śaṁkara suggests certain analogies which have been developed into distinct theories in later Advaita.

It is told of an Irishman that, when asked to describe infinite space, he replied that "space is like a box wid the thop and the botthom and the sides knocked out of it." As the box with its limits and bounds is not space, even so lives bound by the mind and the senses are not Brahman. When we do away with the sides and the bottom of our finite individuality, we are one with Brahman. The theory of limitation[2] is employed in many places. Śaṁkara uses the simile of one cosmic space and parts of space, since it brings out well certain features of the relation of Brahman to the individuals. When the limitations caused by a jar, and the like, are removed, the limited spaces become merged in the one cosmic space. Even so, when the limitations of space, time and causality are removed, the jīvas become one with the absolute self. Again, when the space enclosed in one jar is associated with dust and smoke, the other parts of space are unaffected by them; so, too, when one jīva is affected by pleasure or pain, the others are not affected by it. The one space has different names given to it, owing to its upādhis, while the space itself is unchanged. When the Absolute is merged in these limitations (upādhi-antarbhāva), the nature of Brahman is hidden (svarūpatirobhāva), and the natural omniscience of the Absolute suffers a limitation (upādhiparicchinna). This contact of limitations (upādhisaṁparka) is akin to that of the crystal by the red colour with which it is associated.[3] Space does not burn with bodies or move with vessels.[4] The space in a jar cannot be said to be a part or a transformation of the one infinite space; so also the jīvas are not parts or modifications of Ātman. As space appears to be stained with dirt, etc., to children, even so the Ātman appears as bound or tainted with sin to the ignorant. When the jar is produced or destroyed, the space in it is not produced or destroyed; so also the Ātman is not born nor does it die. Some

[1] When it is said that the ahaṁkāra or self-sense, becomes the knower by its proximity to Ātman, which is reflected in the former, Rāmānuja asks: "Does consciousness become a reflection of the ahaṁkāra, or does the ahaṁkāra become a reflection of consciousness? The former alternative is inadmissible, since you will not allow to consciousness the quality of being a knower; and so is the latter, since the non-intelligent ahaṁkāra can never become a knower" (R.B., i. 1. 1).

[2] Avacchedyāvacchedaka. S.B., i. 3. 7; i. 2. 6; i. 3. 14–18; i. 2. 11–12; ii. 1. 14, 22; ii. 3. 17; iii. 2. 34.

[3] S.B., iii. 2. 15 *Ātmabodha*, p. 16.

[4] S.B., i. 2–8.

of the later followers of the Advaita adopt this view, and hold that the jīva is the universal spirit limited by the internal organ.

It is argued against the theory of limitation, that, when one jīva goes to heaven on account of its potency of merit, the intelligence limited by it in heaven is different from that which was limited by it while on earth. This will have unsatisfactory moral effects, such as the destruction of the rewards of our karma (kṛtanāśa) and attainment of the fruits of actions not performed by the agent (akṛtābhyāgama). We cannot say that the same limited intelligence goes to heaven, for that would be to attribute motion to what is all-pervading. Ether does not go with the jar, whenever we move the latter.

To secure the identity of the enjoying soul, the latter is looked upon not as the limited intelligence but as the reflected intelligence which is inseparably connected with the reflector, *i.e.* mind.[1] In the commentary of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*,[2] Śaṁkara suggests the theory of reflection. As the appearance of sun and moon in water is a mere reflection and nothing real, or as the appearance of red colour in a white crystal is a mere reflection of the red flower and nothing real, since on removing the water, sun and moon only remain, and on removing the red flower the whiteness of the crystal remains unchanged, even so the elements and the individual souls are reflections of the one reality in avidyā and nothing real. On the abolition of avidyā, the reflections cease to exist and only the real remains. The Absolute is the original (bimba) and the world is the reflection (pratibimba). Again, the universe in its variety of forms is like an ocean reflecting the sun of Brahman in various ways, and Śaṁkara supports this view on account of its suggestive value, seeing that it brings out that the original really remains untarnished by the impurities of the reflection. As the differences of the reflections are traced to the mirrors, the Absolute, which is without a second, appears as different individuals through its reflections in different inner organs. When the water in which the reflection is cast is disturbed, the reflection itself appears as disturbed. While the supporters of the limitation theory hold that avidyā, as subtle matter in the form of the inner organ, is an avacchedaka or limitation, or viśeṣaṇa or an essential part of the jīva, without which the jīva as such could not exist, those who support the reflection theory regard the inner organ as an *upādhi*[3] merely, as the matter which receives the reflection of the pure intelligence, and is therefore *present* to it, but does not belong to jīva in its essential nature.

Some of the later followers of the Advaita adopt this view and

[1] S.B., ii. 3. 50; S.B. on Gauḍapāda's *Kārikā*, i. 6.

[2] S.B., Bṛh. Up., ii. 4. 12. See also *Brahmabindu Up.*, p. 12.

[3] While a viśeṣaṇa is an essential predicate which inheres in and is present with the product, *i.e.* the thing defined, an upādhi is not an essential property of the thing defined. Colour is the viśeṣaṇa of a coloured thing, while an earthen vessel is the upādhi of the space which it confines.

regard the jīva as a reflection of the universal spirit in the internal organ.[1] If the world is a shadow, then Brahman is the substance which casts the shadow. The theory of reflection is criticised on several grounds. A thing devoid of form cannot cast any reflection, much less in a formless reflector. Pure intelligence and avidyā are both formless. If the individual is a reflection, then that which is reflected must lie outside the reflector, and the reality which is the original must lie beyond the cosmos or the sum total of created objects. This is opposed to the " immanence " view of the system. The " reflection " hypothesis is not free from the difficulties of the limitation view. The reflection of each mind is due to the intelligence which is adjacent to it, and so it would follow that reflections in the same mind would vary at various places. This criticism forgets the uniform nature of intelligence. If the jīva is a reflection of Brahman, it is different from the latter and is therefore not real. The author of *Vivaraṇa* suggests a way out of this difficulty. The rays proceeding from the eyes are struck by the reflector, turn back and make the actual face perceptible. The reflection is thus the original itself. This view, called bimbapratibimbābheda vāda (or non-difference of the original and the reflection) is, however, not accepted. If the metaphor is taken literally, we require a luminous body, another on which the shadow is cast, and a third which intercepts the light. A reflection requires a really existing medium separate from the projection, but this contradicts the non-dualism of Brahman. Those who reject both the " limitation " and the " reflection " theories [2] declare that the jīva is the unchanging Brahman ignorant of its true nature. Śaṁkara is inclined to this view, as also Sureśvara. Personal consciousness is an inexplicable presentation of Brahman.[3] The jīva appears, but we do not know how.

XXXVIII

ĪŚVARA AND JĪVA

If Īśvara is Brahman, if the jīva is also metaphysically one with Brahman, and if the two are subject to limitations, the difference between God and the individual seems to be minimised. Śaṁkara holds that, while Īśvara is omniscient, all-powerful and all-pervading, the jīva is ignorant, small and weak. " The Lord endowed with superior limiting adjuncts (niratiśayopādhi) [4] rules the souls with inferior limiting

[1] Antaḥkaraṇeṣu pratibimbaṁ jīvacaitanyam (*Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, i).

[2] For a criticism of these theories see S.P.B., i. 152 and 153.

[3] See S.B. on Bṛh. Up., ii. 1.

[4] S.B., ii. 3. 45.

adjuncts (nihīnopādhi).[1] Īśvara is ever free from avidyā.[2] The limitations of Īśvara do not affect his knowledge. Īśvara's māyā is subject to him, and so there is no concealment of his nature. It does not hide his qualities, even as glass which covers objects without concealing their properties. The māyā which is the limitation of Īśvara is made up of śuddhatattva, and does not produce avidyā or antaḥkaraṇa. It is subject to his control, and helps him in his task of creation and destruction. This māyā, or the force of self-expression, in Īśvara, resulting in the multiplicity of the world, deludes the individual soul into the false belief of the independence of the world and the souls in it. Avidyā is the result of māyā. The pure consciousness of Brahman, when associated with māyā in this sense, is called Īśvara, and when with avidyā, jīva. Since Īśvara has no selfish desires or interests in creating the world, he is called akartṛ or non-doer, while the jīva is kartṛ or doer. Īśvara is the worshipped, who distributes rewards according to karma, and he knows his oneness with Brahman, and so enjoys bliss for all time in his own mind. The jīva is the worshipper, who is ignorant of his divine origin, and is therefore subject to saṁsāra. In religion we have the relation of master and servant (svāmibhṛtyayoḥ).[3] Elsewhere the finite selves are said to be parts (aṁśa) of Īśvara, even as sparks are of fire.[4]

In later Advaita, different suggestions are put forward regarding the relation of Īśvara and jīva, which may be briefly noticed here. *Prakaṭārthavivaraṇa* says: "The reflection of Intelligence in māyā, which has no beginning, which is indescribable, which is the source of the inorganic world and which is connected with intelligence only, is Īśvara: the reflection in numerous small portions of that māyā which is possessed of the two powers of enveloping and projecting and known as avidyā is jīva."[5] According to this author, māyā and avidyā refer to the whole and the parts. Māyā is the adjunct of Īśvara and avidyā of jīva. The same view is adopted by *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka*, though the distinction of whole and parts is here said to be one of avidyā and antaḥkaraṇa, where avidyā is the cause and antaḥkaraṇa the effect.[6] Since this author supports the reflection

[1] S.B., ii. 3. 43.
[2] Nityanivṛttāvidyatvāt (S.B., iii. 2. 9).
[3] ii. 3. 43.
[4] S.B., ii. 3. 43.
[5] Anādir anirvācyā, bhūtaprakṛtiś cinmātrasaṁbandhinī māyā; tasyāṁ citpratibimba īśvaraḥ. Tasyā eva paricchinnānantapradeśeṣv āvaraṇavikṣepaśaktimatsvavidyābhidhāneṣu citpratibimbo jīva iti (*Siddhāntaleśa*, i).
[6] Avidyāyāṁ cit pratibimba īśvaraḥ; antaḥkaraṇe citpratibimbojīvaḥ. (S.L.S.)

theory, he does not approve of the division of whole and parts. *Pañcadaśī* adopts a distinction which is akin to it. The primitive non-intelligent principle of mūlaprakṛti, consisting of three guṇas, has two forms. That portion of it where sattva is not subordinate to rajas and tamas, but dominates the latter, is called māyā, and is the adjunct of Īśvara; that in which sattva is subordinate to the other two qualities is avidyā, which is the adjunct of jīva. The difference between māyā and avidyā is here not simply quantitative but qualitative. It comes out also in another passage of *Pañcadaśī*, where prakṛti, with its power of projection in prominence, is called māyā; the same, with the power of concealment dominating, is avidyā.[1] In *Pañcadaśī*,[2] Vidyāraṇya distinguishes ākāśa (1) limited by a jar (ghaṭākāśa); (2) that which is reflected together with clouds, storms, etc., in the water contained in the jar, or ākāśa, belonging to the water of the jar (jalākāśa); (3) the unlimited ākāśa (mahākāśa); and (4) that which is reflected in particles of water which resemble spray, which are inferrible as existing in the clouds of the sky, from the subsequent rain (meghākāśa). Even so there are four kinds of intelligence: (1) kūṭastha, or the unchanging intelligence limited by gross and subtle bodies; (2) the intelligence reflected in the manas, falsely superimposed on the unchanging intelligence (the jīva); (3) the unlimited intelligence; and (4) the intelligence reflected in the subtle impressions of mind[3] of all creatures which exist in the cloudlike māyā hanging in Brahman (Īśvara). From this account, it follows that while jīva is the intelligence reflected in manas, Īśvara is the intelligence reflected in māyā tinged with the subtle impressions of all creatures. The author of *Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa* regards the jīva as a reflection of Īśvara.[4] Sometimes jīva is said to be Īśvara under the influence of māyā.

XXXIX

EKAJĪVAVĀDA (SINGLE SOUL THEORY) AND ANEKAJĪVAVĀDA (THEORY OF MANY SOULS)

Śaṁkara does not support the view that the jīva, limited by avidyā, is one, as avidyā is one. For if all souls are one jīva, then when the first case of liberation occurred, mundane existence should have come to an end, which is not the case. Brahman, limited by the different inner organs born of avidyā, becomes divided, as it were, into many individual souls, but

[1] i. [2] vi. [3] Dhīvāsanā.

[4] These take their stand on the *Antaryami Brāhmaṇa* of the Bṛh. Up., vi. 7, and such passages of the B.G. as "Īśvaras sarvabhūtānāṁ hṛddeśe 'rjuna tiṣṭhati."

the difficulties of the relation of māyā and avidyā to Brahman led to the formulation of several theories in the later Advaita, of which the two chief are ekajīvavāda, single soul theory, and anekajīvavāda, or the theory of a plurality of souls.

There is but one jīva and one material body. This one personal consciousness is real, while other bodies like those seen in dreams lack personal consciousness. The manifold world is erroneously imagined by the avidyā of the one jīva, but this type of ekajīvavāda conflicts with B.S., ii. 1. 22; ii. 1. 33 and i. 2. 3. The creator of the world is not jīva, but Īśvara other than jīva, whose creative activity is due to mere sport; for since all his desires are fulfilled, he can have no motive in creating. So these writers maintain that there is one chief jīva, *viz.* Hiraṇyagarbha, who is a reflection of Brahman, and other jīvas are mere semblances of jīva, reflections of Hiraṇyagarbha, and to these semblances pertain bondage and final release. These writers admit the doctrine of the unity of jīva, with the qualification that many material bodies exist, each provided with an unreal jīva. A third variety of ekajīvavāda holds that there is one jīva residing in each of the many bodies. The individuality of consciousness depends on the numerical distinctness of the material bodies. The upholders of this view do not admit the force of the objection that just as the one person is variously conscious as the different parts of his body are affected, so the one jīva should at once be conscious of the pleasures and pains belonging to all the numerically distinct material bodies in which it resides. For, they say, the fact that we are not conscious of the pleasures and pains of a former state of existence proves that it is the numerical distinction of material bodies which hinders such a consciousness. They adopt the doctrine of the unity of jīva with a multiplicity of bodies.

There are varieties of anekajīvavāda, resulting from different conceptions of avidyā. (1) It is the presence of avidyā in the form of an inner organ that is essential to the jīva nature. If the inner organ, etc., are the conditions which constitute a jīva, and if these organs are many, it follows that the jīvas are many. (2) Others hold that though there is one avidyā which resides in Brahman as its substrate and conceals Brahman, though final release is nothing but the destruction of this avidyā, yet avidyā has parts, and some part of avidyā (otherwise termed its projecting power) must be admitted to exist in the case of the person who gains release while still living in this body; this avidyā ceases to exist in part, *i.e.* as regards some one limiting condition or other, when a knowledge of Brahman has arisen; and continues to exist as before in other parts, *i.e.* as regards the remaining limiting conditions. (In the jīvanmukta state the individual retains a consciousness of his body in the form of a saṁskāra, or mental *retentum*, which is a subtle form of avidyā; in the videhakaivalya state, the consciousness of body ceases to exist.) (3) A third variety, similar to the above, holds that bondage consists in the relation of

avidyā and intelligence, and final release consists in the cessation of this relation. The inner organ or manas determines the relation of avidyā to intelligence. When the rise of the intuition of Brahman puts an end to the manas, then avidyā ceases to be in relation with that particular part of intelligence, though it continues as before in relation with the remaining parts of intelligence. (4) Avidyā is a whole and is completely present in each jīva, hiding Brahman from each jīva. Final release is when avidyā quits a jīva. (5) Avidyā consists of parts which are distributed to each jīva. Mokṣa of a jīva consists in the destruction of the avidyā belonging to it. The world as a whole has its origin in all the avidyās collectively. " As a piece of cloth has its origin in all the threads collectively, and ceases to exist when one of its threads is destroyed, and as a new piece of cloth is produced at that time out of the remaining threads ; so this world originates from all the avidyās collectively, and it ceases to exist when one of the jīvas attains release . . . and a new world common to all the remaining jīvas is produced at that time out of the remaining avidyās." (6) Each part of avidyā gives rise to a separate and distinct world. The whole world of sense and activity is restricted to each person and produced by the avidyā residing in that particular person, even as the merely apparent silver (perceived in place of the shell) is different for each observer and is produced by the avidyā residing in each observer. . . . But that these many worlds should appear to be one, is a pure misapprehension similar to that expressed in the words, " I too saw the very same silver which you saw." (7) Others hold that there is but one world, whose material cause is māyā, residing in the Īśvara, which is different from the aggregate of avidyās as residing in the jīvas. These avidyās, on the other hand, have their function partly in concealing Brahman and partly in projecting merely apparent objects, as false silver observed in the shell and objects seen in dreams.[1]

XL

ETHICS

Of all items of the universe, the human individual alone is the ethical subject. He knows that he has relations to the two worlds of the infinite and the finite. The operation of the infinite in the finite is not a mere poetic vision, but is the sober truth of philosophy. The infinite dwells in all finite, and man is conscious of this fact. Though he is bound up with an organism which is mechanically determined by the past, the infinite ideals of truth, beauty and goodness operate

[1] See *Siddhāntaleśa*.

in him and enable him to choose and strive for their greater expression. It is because the infinite Brahman is revealed to a larger extent in human beings that they are entitled to ethical and logical activity.[1] So long as the individual strains after them and does not reach them, he is in bondage; the moment he reaches the infinite, the inner strain is relaxed and the freedom of joy fills his spirit. To realise Brahman is the end of all activities, for Brahman is not mere being or consciousness but also bliss (ānanda), and so is the object of all striving.[2] Brahmātmaikatva, or the realisation of the identity with the infinite reality, is the final end of life, "the proper food of every soul,"[3] and the only supreme value. Until it is reached the finite soul is at unrest with itself. "Every one in all the three worlds strives for the sources of happiness and not for those of misery."[4] All men seek the best, and, as Browning says, have

> All with a touch of nobleness despite
> Their error, upward tending all though weak—
> Like plants in mines which never saw the sun,
> But dream of him, and guess where he may be,
> And do their best to climb and get to him.

The best fruits which we can pluck from the tree of life (saṁsāra) turn to ashes in our mouth. The greatest pleasure palls and even life in heaven (svarga) is evanescent. A mere act of goodness or enjoyment of a sweet melody or contemplative insight may, for the moment, seem to lift us out of the narrowness of our individuality, but it cannot give us permanent satisfaction. The only object that can give us permanent satisfaction is the experience of Brahman (brahmānubhava). It is the supreme state of joy and peace and the perfection of individual development.[5] Unfortunately

[1] Prādhānyāt . . . karmajñānādhikāraḥ (S.B., Tait. Up., ii. 1).

[2] Prayojanasūcanārtham ānandagrahaṇam (*Śikhāmaṇi* on *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, Introduction).

[3] *Phædrus*, p. 247.

[4] *Śataśloki*, p. 15.

[5] "The essence of mokṣa or release is boundless joy and utter removal of pain. As it is perfectly clear that men always desire both, there is always a desire for release" (*Saṁkṣepaśārīraka*, i. 67). Cp. Spinoza: "All our happiness or unhappiness depends solely on the quality of the object on which our love is fixed. . . . But love towards an object eternal and infinite feeds the mind with a joy that is pure with no tinge of sadness" (*De Intellectus Emendatione*, pp. 9 and 10).

our trouble arises because we cling to the world, cherish faith in its phantoms and feel disappointed when the mocking semblances of finite satisfactions vanish even as we reach them. "The individual sinks down in sin and grief so long as he believes that his body is the Ātman, but when he realises that he is one with the self of all things, his grief ceases."[1] We cannot manipulate reality into accord with any ideal of our mind, but have only to recognise it. Philosophy with Śaṁkara is not the production of what *ought to be*, but is the apprehension of what *is*. A spiritual perception of the infinite as the real leads to peace and joy.

All ethical goods, bound up as they are with the world of distinctions, are valuable as means to the end. While self-realisation is the absolute good, ethical goods are only relatively so. The ethically "good" is what helps the realisation of the infinite, and the ethically "bad" is its opposite.

Right action is what embodies truth, and wrong that which embodies untruth.[2] Whatever leads to a better future existence is good, and what brings about a worse form of existence evil. The individual tries to make good his infinite nature and become more and more godlike. In the empirical world, Īśvara is the highest reality and the world is his creation. The believer in God should love the whole universe, which is a product of God. True peace and excellence lie not in self-assertion, not in individual striving for one's own good, but in offering oneself as a contribution to the true being of the universe. Egoism is the greatest evil, and love and compassion are the greatest good. By identifying ourselves with the social good, we truly gain our real ends. Every individual must subdue his senses, which make for self-assertion; pride must give place to humility, resentment to forgiveness, narrow attachment to family to universal benevolence. It is not so much the deed that is valuable as the will to suppress one's selfish will and assert the will of society. Duties are the opportunities afforded to man to sink his separate self and grow out into the world. Śaṁkara accepts the standards of his age and exhorts us to avoid the

[1] S.B. on Muṇḍ. Up., iii. 1. 2.

[2] Cp. "Everyone that doeth evil hateth the light" (*St. John* iii. 19).

sins forbidden by the śāstras. The study of the Veda, sacrifices, gifts, penances and fasts are a means of knowledge.[1] They strengthen character, purify the spirit and deepen insight. Though rare spirits might grasp the truth at once, for the ordinary man time and effort are needed. Fulfilment of the daily obligations of life and the demands of household piety,[2] produce a frame of mind favourable to realisation.[3] Vedic rituals, when scrupulously observed, lead to abhyudaya (literally ascent or progress in the scale of saṁsāra), and not to niḥśreyasa or salvation.[4] While spiritual insight into the nature of ultimate reality has for its result mokṣa, the worship of God in this or that form leads to a variety of effects, though all these are confined to the world of saṁsāra.[5] They help us to escape from selfish desire, hatred and dullness, and attain calm, peace and patience in suffering. Devout meditation is a means to knowledge. Bhakti aids jñāna. True wisdom is won only by those whose minds are prepared by a rigorous discipline. It is not a question of pouring into the mind some kind of knowledge of which it is destitute. Truth is in the centre of the soul. To let it shine, the mind has to be turned from the perishing world. Our understanding must be made transparent like the glass of the lamp through which shines the light within. "Though the Ātman is at all times and in all things, it does not shine in all things. It shines only through understanding, just as reflection appears only in polished surfaces."[6] Śaṁkara attaches great importance to philosophical wisdom, which can be attained only through a practice of virtue. While jñāna leads to release, other means help its attainment indirectly.[7] "The desire to know Brahman springs only in the person whose mind is pure,

[1] Bṛh. Up., iv. 4. 22.
[2] S.B., iii. 4. 26.
[3] iv. 1. 4.
[4] S.B. on Muṇḍ. Up., Introduction.
[5] S.B., i. 1. 24. See also iii. 2. 21.
[6] Sadāsarvagato 'py ātmā, na sarvatrāvabhāsate.
Buddhyāvevāvabhāseta, svaccheṣu pratibimbavat. (*Ātmabodha*, p. 17.)
[7] S.B., iv. 1. 1; S.B. on Tait. Up., i. 3. Plato recommends for philosophers the pursuit of wisdom, which has for its final fruit the vision of the idea of the Good, and for others true opinion, which is limited to one's station and its duties. See *Phædo* and *Republic*. Similarly, Aristotle recommends for the ordinary men "moral virtues," which are emphatically "human affairs," and for those who aim at immortality the exercise of reason, "which apprehends things noble and divine" (*Nichomachean Ethics*, x. 8).

who is free from desires, and who, free from deeds done in this birth or in previous ones, becomes disgusted with the external ephemeral medley of ends and means."[1] Śaṁkara accepts the principle of the yoga practice, which has for its chief end samādhi, what Śaṁkara calls saṁrādhana or complete satisfaction, which consists in withdrawing the senses from everything external and concentrating them on one's own nature. The Advaita accepts the yogic distinctions of yama, niyama, etc., as the outer means (bahiraṅgasādhanas) and dhāraṇa and dhyāna as the inner means (antaraṅgasādhanas).[2] The inner requirements are also stated to be the discrimination between the eternal and the non-eternal, detachment from all selfish endeavours for earthly or heavenly good, the development of the virtues of tranquillity (śama), restraint (dama), renunciation (uparati), resignation (titīkṣā), concentration (samādhi) and steadfastness of mind (śraddhā), and lastly an intense desire for freedom. These bring about the rise of true knowledge.[3]

A thinker who is reaching forward to a larger conception of truth does not break entirely from the common beliefs of his age. Though the efficacy of caste institutions has ceased to be vital for Śaṁkara, he allows room for belief in it. The traditional theory that birth in a particular caste is not a matter of chance, but is the necessary consequence of conduct in a former existence, inclines Śaṁkara to accept the claim of the upper classes, gods and ṛṣis, for the exclusive right to study the Veda.[4] While Śaṁkara holds that any man of any caste can attain the highest knowledge,[5] he allows that those who follow the Brahminical rule of life should observe the obligations of caste and the stages of life. While the Brahmin may study the Veda and acquire wisdom, others may resort to worship and the like and attain the same goal

[1] S.B., Kena Up., Introduction. See also S.B., Chān. Up., Introduction, and viii. 5. 1; Bṛh. Up., iv. 4. 22; Kaṭha, i. 2. 15.

[2] The Vedāntic śravaṇa and manana answer to dhāraṇa and steps to it, nididhyāsana to dhyāna, and darśana to samādhi.

[3] S.B., iii. 4. 27.

[4] The cases of Jānaśruti (Chān., iv. 1. 2), who was called a Śūdra by Raikva, who, however, taught him the Vedas, and Satyakāma Jābāla, are explained away on the ground that so long as a śūdra is not raised to a higher caste in the path of saṁsāra, he is not entitled to the saving knowledge.

[5] S.B., iii. 4. 38.

of brahmajñāna.[1] It is difficult to find support in Śaṁkara for the claim that only through the study of the Veda can one acquire a knowledge of Brahman. As in his philosophy, so in his views of Hindu dharma, Śaṁkara tries to reconcile conflicting claims. By throwing open the highest knowledge or brahmajñāna to all who bear the human face divine (puruṣamātra), irrespective of caste or creed, he shows his fundamental humanity and his firm adherence to the logical implications of his Advaita philosophy. But he concedes to the Brahminical faith that the Śūdras, like Vidura, who attained the highest wisdom, did so as a result of their past conduct. If a Śūdra has capacity to understand the truth now, we may take it that he has studied the Veda in a previous life. Thus Śaṁkara undermined the belief of the exclusive right of the upper classes to salvation. He was willing to regard all who possess spiritual insight as his gurus, whether they were Brahmins or pariahs. "He who has learned to look upon the phenomenal world in the light of non-dualism is my true teacher, be he a caṇḍāla (pariah) or a dvija (twice-born). This is my conviction." [2]

The rules of āśramas or stages of life are insisted on. To gain salvation, one need not become a saññyāsin. In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and the *Chāndogya Upaniṣads*, gṛhasthas, or householders, acquired and taught brahmavidyā. Saññyāsins, however, are best entitled to it, since it is easier for them to acquire it than for others, since they are not called upon to undertake active worship, household duties or vedic rites. Śaṁkara insists that those who follow the āśrama rules must become saññyāsins before they attain release, though there is no such obligation for those who do not adhere to the āśrama rules. The saññyāsins are grounded in Brahman (brahmasaṁsthā). "Such a state is impossible for those belonging to the three other stages of life, as scripture declares that they suffer loss through the non-performance of the works enjoined on their stage of life, while the saññyāsin can suffer no loss owing to non-performance." [3] Again, "Although

[1] Puruṣamātrasaṁbandhibhir japopavāsadevatārādhanādibhir dharmaviśeṣair anugraho vidyāyās saṁbhavati.

[2] *Manīṣapañcaka*. See also *Kaupīnapañcaka*, pp. 3 and 5.

[3] S.B., iii. 4. 20.

jñāna is permitted to all in any order of life, it is only that possessed by a saññyāsin that leads to freedom and not that combined with karma."[1] Śaṁkara felt in the practical religion of the Hindus the want of discipline and a common standard, and so rearranged the ascetic orders and thus tried to obtain for Hinduism the disciplinary advantages of the Buddhist organisation.[2] Obsessed by the lesson which the Buddhistic admission of women in the body of ordained ascetics had taught, Śaṁkara excluded women from his monasteries, which were mainly intended as seats of learning and asylums for those who courted poverty, austere purity of life and freedom from the thraldom of the world. Śaṁkara ignored caste distinctions in the monastic order he founded.

The rules of varṇāśrama are binding on the Hindus, since they express the higher mind of the community. These are not to be regarded as externally imposed on the individuals who do not exist simply for the community. The moral value of the individual does not depend entirely on his contribution to the community. Man is not like a piece of clay to be moulded from outside. He has to be persuaded from within. The śāstras do not compel a man to do this or that, but simply remind men of the collective experience of the race.[3] Apart from general principles, conventions alter from place to place.[4] Moral life deepens as we progress higher and higher.[5] Customary morality is something which is ever growing. The Vedic rule of life is not an indispensable aid to wisdom. Even those who are not entitled to it attained the highest goal. The poor and the outcast may by prayer and worship, fasting and sacrifice, attain the goal through the grace of God.[6]

He who realises the goal is the true Brahmin, the knower

[1] S.B., Introduction to Muṇḍaka Up. Sayññāsaniṣṭhaiva brahmavidyā mokṣasādhanam na karmasahiteti.

[2] Vidyāranya after Śaṁkara (see Introduction to Bhāsya on *Ait. Up.*) distinguishes vividiṣāsaññyāsa or the renunciation of the seeker from the vidvatsaññyāsa or the renunciation of the saved; while the first is optional, the second eventually follows the attainment of vidyā. The first, if adopted, is to be carried out in the orthodox way; the second has no regulations binding it. See *Jīvanmuktiviveka.*

[3] Jñāpakaṁ hi śāstraṁ, na kārakam. See also S.B., Bṛh. Up., ii. 1. 20.

[4] S.B., i. 1. 4. [5] *Ibid.* [6] S.B., iii. 4. 36–39.

of Brahman. The way in which he lives is described by Śaṁkara, who quotes the following passage :—

> Whom no one knows as high nor lowly born,
> No one as erudite, nor yet not erudite,
> No one as of good deeds, nor of evil deeds,
> He is a Brāhmaṇa in very truth.
> Given up to hidden duties well fulfilled,
> In secrecy let all his life be spent;
> As he were blind and deaf, of sense bereft,
> Thus let the truly wise pass through the world.[1]

It is life in the spirit full of meekness and peace, holiness and joy, and not sinking into a state of contemplative inertia. His activities do not bind him. His karma is not karma in the ordinary sense.[2] While some liberated undertake the minimum activity for sustaining life (jīvanamātrārtham), others throw themselves into the work of the world (lokasaṁgrahārtham).[3] This activity of the liberated is not centred in the individualistic standpoint [4] and so is not to be regarded as binding the individual to the circuit.[5] The freed souls,

[1] Yaṁ na santam na cāsantam, nāśrutam na bahuśrutam
Na suvṛttaṁ na durvṛttaṁ veda kaścit sa brāhmaṇaḥ.
Gūḍhadharmāśrito vidvān ajñātacaritaṁ caret
Andhavaj jaḍavac cāpi mūkavac ca mahīṁ caret.
(S.B., iii. 4. 50; D.S.V., p. 144.)

[2] Viduṣaḥ kriyamāṇam api karma paramārthato'karmeva (S.B.G., iv. 20).

[3] S.B.G., iv. 19.

[4] S.B., iv. 1. 13.

[5] "He who, when awake, is as though in a sound sleep, and sees not duality, or, if seeing it, regards it as non-duality, who, though acting, is free from the results of actions, he, and he alone, is without doubt the knower of self" (*Upadeśasāhasrī*, p. 45). "He who, whether active or at rest, links not his ego with his act and allows not his mind to be affected, is said to be the real jīvanmukta." ' He who, though deep in intercourse with all things, is ever as cool and unconcerned as in attending to another's business, full of peace and contentment, is said to be the real jīvanmukta." Rāma asks Vaśiṣṭha: "Tell me which of the two is better than the other, he who is ever at rest though mixing in the world, even like one awakened from a prolonged trance, or he who rises to and remains in trance in some solitary corner ?" And his guru Vaśiṣṭha replies: "Trance is only that internal calm which comes of looking upon this world and the guṇas which create it as all not-self. Having gained this pleasant calm within from the conviction ' I have no touch with the objective,' the yogin may remain in the world or shut himself up in meditation. Both, O Rāma, are equally good if the fire of desire is entirely cooled down within" [illegible] quoted in *Jīvanmuktiviveka*, i and iv).

who save themselves by their effort, save the world by their example.

While Vedic injunctions and moral rules are necessary for those involved in the circle of saṁsāra, they lose their point for the soul who leaves behind the whole sphere of desire and turns back on the differences of saṁsāra.[1] The question is raised whether the released soul can do what he will. Śaṁkara answers that, since selfish attachment that moves to action is absent in the case of the released soul, he does not act at all.[2] Action which arises from avidyā cannot coexist with a true knowledge of spirit.[3] While such explanations seem to deny all action whatsoever to the released soul, there are other passages in Śaṁkara which make out that the released soul, free from all selfish desire, acts in a disinterested way.[4] Evil action is psychologically impossible for him. Freedom from moral laws is mentioned as a glorification, alaṁkāra or ornament of the state of liberation and not an invitation to violate the moral laws. In no case is it to be regarded as encouraging the neglect of morality. The freed soul is lifted up into such a relationship with the absolute spirit that it is impossible for him to sin. He has verily died to sin. Śaṁkara's attitude is not to be confused with that taken sometimes by the Antinomians in the Christian Church. While it is true that the freed soul " has no longer any object to aim at, since he has achieved all," [5] still he works for the welfare of the world. Besides, while Śaṁkara holds that moral *obligation* has no meaning for the freed soul, he does not say that the moral virtues are abandoned by him.[6] Moral perfection leads to the death, not of morality, but of moralistic individualism. Rules of conduct have their force so long as we are struggling upward, working out the beast in us. They help to keep us straight when there is danger of our going

[1] Cp. Nistraiguṇye pathi vicaratāṁ ko vidhiḥ ko niśedhaḥ ?

[2] Na ca niyogābhāvāt saṁyagdarśino yatheṣṭaceṣṭāprasaṅgaḥ . . . sarvatrābhimānasyaiva pravartakatvāt, abhimānābhāvāc ca saṁyagdarśinaḥ (S.B., ii. 3. 48).

[3] See S.B., Introduction to Tait. Up.

[4] S.B.G., iv. 21.

[5] Introduction to S.B.G., v.

[6] Sureśvara says: 'To the person in whom the realisation of the supreme arises, non-hatred and other qualities will be a habit requiring no effort; they are no longer virtues to be acquired by conscious exertion " (*Naiṣharmyasiddhi*, iv. 69).

wrong. As rules of murder, theft and the like do not worry the civilised man, so the spiritual man is not concerned with the conventional rules of morality.

XLI

Some Objections to Śaṁkara's Ethics Considered

The ethical views of Śaṁkara have been the subject of much criticism, and we may briefly consider the several charges.[1] If all that exists is Brahman, and if the world of plurality is a shadow, there cannot be any real distinction between good and evil. If the world is a shadow, sin is less than a shadow. Why should not a man play with sin and enjoy a crime, since they are only shadows? What shall it profit us if we fight wild beasts and sacrifice our interests in seeking virtue in this dream of life? If moral distinctions are valid, life is real; if life is unreal, then they are not valid. This objection falls to the ground if we do not accept the merely illusory nature of the world. Virtue and vice have moral weight for the supreme end.

On the view of the metaphysical identity of the individual and the Absolute, it is said, there is no warrant for ethics. If Brahman is all, there is no need for any moral endeavour. This objection rests upon a confusion between reality and existence, the eternal and the temporal. Śaṁkara does not say that the essentially imperfect and incomplete series of temporal events is the same as true timeless Brahman. The metaphysical truth of the oneness of Brahman does not in any way prejudice the validity of the ethical distinctions on the empirical level. Śaṁkara says: "Fire is one only, and yet we shun a fire which has consumed dead bodies, not any other fire; the sun is one only, yet we shun only that part of his light which shines on unholy places, not that part which falls on pure ground. Some things consisting of earth are desired, such as diamonds and beryls, other things likewise

[1] For an acute criticism of the ethics of the Advaita Vedānta and Deussen's reformulation of it, see Professor Hogg's article on "Advaita and Ethics" in the *Madras Christian College Magazine*, December 1916.

consisting of earth are shunned, dead bodies, etc."[1] Even so, though all things are Brahman ultimately, there are certain things to be avoided and others to be desired. The statement "I am Brahman" (aham brahmāsmi) does not mean direct identity[2] of the active self with the ultimate Brahman, but only identity of the real self when the false imposition is removed.[3] The ethical problem arises, because there is the constant struggle between the infinite character of the soul and the finite dress in which it has clothed itself. While the natural condition of man is one of integrity, the present state of corruption is due to a fall from it by the force of upādhis.[4] Our struggle with imperfection will have no meaning, if we rise to a point of view from which we behold the real. The struggle will go on until the isolation from the infinite is broken down. Until the finite soul realises that it is Brahman, it is at unrest with itself and feels homesick for its native country. We have duties and destinies as finite agents. Each individual is responsible for his work, and work done by one individual cannot be completed by another.[5]

The ethics of Śaṁkara is said to be intellectualistic, for avidyā or non-discrimination is the cause of our bondage.[6] Mithyājñāna of the jīva is the basis of all experience and activity; saṁyagjñāna or knowledge of oneness leads to freedom.[7] As the distinction between the highest self and the individual is one of false knowledge,[8] we get rid of it by true knowledge. All this leads one to believe that salvation is the result of metaphysical insight, and not moral perfection. Deussen regards this feature of the Advaita Vedānta as its "fundamental want." "Rightly," he says, "the Vedānta recognises as the sole source by which we may reach true knowledge, true apprehension of being in itself, our own 'I'; but it wrongly halts at the form in which it directly appeals

[1] S.B., ii. 3. 48. [2] Mukhyasāmānādhikaraṇya.

[3] Bādhasāmānyādhikaraṇya.

[4] Eckhart asks: "What would it avail a man if he were king and knew it not?" The kingdom of heaven is a lost province.

[5] S.B., iii. 3. 53. See also iii. 2. 9. [6] S.B., ii. 3. 48.

[7] S.B., i. 2–8. See also iii. 2. 25 and iv. 2. 8; S.B., i. 3. 19.

[8] Mithyājñānakṛta eva jīvaparameśvarayor bhedo na vastukṛtaḥ (S.B., i. 3. 19). See S.B. on Gauḍapāda's *Kārikā*, Introduction. Cp. jñānaṁ vinā mokṣo na siddhyati (*Ātmabodha*). Vivekāvivekamātreṇaiva (S.B., i. 3. 19). See also *Aparokṣānubhūti*, p. 14.

to our consciousness, as a knower, even after it has cut away the whole intellectual apparatus, and ascribed it to the not 'I,' the world of phenomena, just as it has also, very rightly, indicated as the dwelling of the highest soul, not as Descartes did the head, but the heart." [1] If the one and only existent Brahman is already perfect, and if all that we have to do is to assert its reality and deny the reality of everything else, there is no motive for ethical action. If the only way to escape the evils of finitude is simply to deny them, there is no room for any earnest ethics. We need not be serious about conquering hatred or changing our nature. But we have to remember that avidyā, though it is predominantly a logical concept, signifies, in the metaphysics of Śaṁkara, a whole attitude of life. "Avidyā is the conceit that the 'I' consists in the bodily nature; hence arise the worship of the body, which is passion, the despising of it, which is hate; thoughts of injury to it rouse fear, and so on." [2] False knowledge is the basis of all selfish desire and activity.[3] Avidyā is the finiteness of the finite individual impelling him to lead a life of desire and strife, consequent on the ignorance of his oneness with Brahman. Vices of character are not merely follies and errors, but perversions of will, and violations of the voice of God. Frequently Śaṁkara uses the one compound "avidyākāmakarma," [4] where avidyā represents the cognitive error of looking upon the diversity of individuals as real,[5] kāma the emotional response towards the object and karma the practical act, to gain it or avoid it. It is this whole attitude of individualistic action that is rooted in a confusion between the real and the unreal, that leads to saṁsāra.[6] Kāma is born of avidyā, and karma is the result

[1] D.S.V., p. 59.

[2] Dehādiṣv anātmasv, aham asmīty ātmabuddhir avidyā; tatas tat-pūjanādau rāgaḥ; tatparibhavādau dveṣaḥ; taducchedadarśanād bhayam, etc. (S.B., i. 3. 2).

[3] S.B., Kena Up., Introduction: Saṁsārabījam ajñānaṁ kāmakarma pravṛttikāraṇam. Again: "Avidyākāmakarmalakṣaṇaṁ saṁsārabījam" (S.B. on Kena Up., iv. 9).

[4] S.B. on Muṇḍ. Up., iii. 1. 1.

[5] Avidyākalpitaṁ lokaprasiddhaṁ jīvabhedam (S.B., ii. 1. 14; i. 3. 19).

[6] Anātmadarśino hy anātmaviṣayaḥ kāmaḥ; kāmayamānaś ca karoti karmāṇi; tatas tatphalopabhogāya śarīrād upādānalakṣaṇas saṁsāraḥ. (S.B., Tait. Up., i. 11.)

of kāma. The state of freedom is said to be the removal of the error, the restoration of the true desires and the suppression of all selfish endeavour.[1] The discipline of moral life includes the suppression of selfish activity, the development of true desires and the overcoming of empirical individualism. Until the last happens, we are not perfected in nature. We may suppress our kāma, we may act for the welfare of the world, but there is no security that we should not succumb to the temptation of a false desire or a selfish activity at another moment of our life; but until we cut the very roots of eager desire and petty egoism, until avidyā is abolished, we cannot be sure that we shall occupy the impersonal attitude of true enlightenment. The moral man is disinterested by chance; the saint is disinterested, thanks to his enlightenment.[2]

Śaṁkara distinguishes parokṣajñāna or logical learning, which we derive from books and teachers, that the supreme self and the individual are one, and aparokṣajñāna or anubhava, which is the experience of the seer who has surrendered his sense of separateness and realised his oneness with the Supreme.[3] Śaṁkara tells us that the former is incapable of releasing us from bondage. Commenting on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*,[4] Śaṁkara says that one must raise oneself step by step from the state of mere learning (pāṇḍityam) to that of childlike simplicity (bālyam)[5] and from it to the state of the silent muni, and last of all to the state of the true Brahmin, who renounces in spirit all possessions and pleasures which are different from Brahman and so likely to bring subjection. The Advaita is both a philosophy and a religion.

[1] Sarvavāsanākṣayaṁ sarvakāmavināśaṁ sarvakarmapravilayam.

[2] See a very suggestive article by Professor Hiriyanna on this question in the *Proceedings of the Indian Oriental Conference*, Poona, vol. ii. Speaking of the distinction between true enlightenment and æsthetic delight, he says: ' To use Śaṁkara's words, the ever recurring series of kāma and karma, or interest and activity, constitutes life. The elimination of kāma and karma while their cause avidyā continues in a latent form marks the æsthetic attitude; the dismissal of avidyā even in this latent form marks the saintly attitude" (p. 241).

[3] Cp. *Varāhopaniṣad.*

Asti brahmeti ced veda parokṣajñānam eva tat
Aham brahmeti ced veda sākṣātkāras sa ucyate.

[4] iii. 8. 10. See also Chān. Up., iv. 1. 7.

[5] Cp. *St. Matthew*, xviii. 3.

Enlightenment results in experience immediate and certain.[1] It is not the pursuit of a remote ideal.

In the same spirit it is maintained that cittaśuddhi or purification of the heart is a necessary prerequisite for spiritual realisation. This involves the increasing domination of the sattva quality and the suppression of rajas and tamas. It is brought about by disinterested work and practice of spiritual exercises. It does not supersede morality, but implies it. "When and to whomsoever the notion of the personal ego conveyed by 'I' (aham) and the notion of personal possession conveyed by 'mine' (mama) cease to be real, then he is the knower of Ātman."[2] Until selfish desire (kāma) is suppressed, avidyā cannot be rooted out. Jñāna has a larger sense than its English equivalent, knowledge. It is true wisdom, life at its highest stretch.[3] It is not the acceptance of a given dogma, but the living experience of which the intellectual apprehension is but the outward symbol. Śaṁkara has no great admiration for abstract intelligence. The highest intelligence, according to him, consists in the knowledge that intelligence alone is not enough. The end, it is true, is the destruction of avidyā, but we cannot get rid of avidyā by simply denying its reality. We are not said to know Brahman simply because we have a speculative notion of its being. Brahmajñāna is the spiritual realisation of our rootedness in the eternal, which remains an abiding possession, a part of our very being.

It is said that it is a weakness of Śaṁkara's system that he does not regard moral values as ultimately real. Moral distinctions have a meaning only so long as our ego is sharply marked off from whatever lies outside its body in space and beyond its experience in time. The moral world, which assumes the isolation and independence of its members, belongs to the world of appearances. The duties commanded and the claims that call for satisfaction are both alike the personal affairs of individuals. The command and the claim are based on the assumed independence of the finite individuals.

[1] Anubhavārūḍham eva ca vidyāphalaṁ na kriyāphalavat kālāntarabhāvi (S.B., iii. 4. 15).

[2] *Upadeśasāhasrī*, xiv. 29. See also xiv. 141. See also S.B. on Kena Up., Introduction.

[3] See Plato's *Timæus*, p. 90; Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*, x. 7.

So long as we occupy the standpoint of individualistic moralism, we are in the world of saṁsāra, with its hazards and hardships. Moral growth consists in a gradual correction of the individualistic point of view, and when the correction is complete, the moral as such ceases to exist. So long as the latter persists, the ideal is unrealised. The end of morality is to lift oneself up above one's individuality and become one with the impersonal spirit of the universe. But, so long as there is a trace of individuality clinging to the moral subject, this lifting up can only be partial. To attain oneness with the infinite, on the basis of the finite, is evidently an impossible task. To realise the ideal, we must pass beyond the moral life and rise to the spiritual realisation in which the life of finite struggle and endeavour is transcended. So Śaṁkara insists repeatedly on the inadequacy of moral goodness and finite striving, so far as the ideal of perfection is concerned. Karma cannot lead to mokṣa. The finite as finite must be transcended. Avidyā, which is the basis of all finite life, must be overcome. We must break through the circuit of saṁsāra, of ignorance, attachment and action (avidyākāmakarma), to recognise our oneness with the supreme spirit. However moral we may be, so long as mere goodness does not take us beyond the finite and break the barriers of avidyā, perfection is beyond us. So Śaṁkara argues that we cannot win mokṣa by any amount of striving; for all karma, whether it be observance of Vedic rites or devotion to God, leads only to a conservation of the finite as finite, and involves us in saṁsāra, or the struggle of the finite for the infinite, endlessly prolonged. Release from this revolving wheel comes through jñāna, or the insight which lifts us out of our individuality into the oneness with the infinite.[1] Morality is of the nature of development, and cannot lead to a realisation of the truth which is self-existent. If moral progress is the central feature

[1] The attitude of the late Professor Bosanquet on this question is analogous to that of Śaṁkara, and his interpretation of the justification by faith is similar to Śaṁkara's view of release through jñāna. Cp.: "We are one with the whole by faith, and not in works. Here our inadequacy is done away. This is the very meaning of 'saving experiences.' We throw ourselves upon the grace of the universe and find in oneness with it an adequacy which is self-contradictory for us as finite agents" (*The Meeting of Extremes in Contemporary Philosophy*, p. 173). See also *Mind*, N.S., vol. xxx. p. 98.

of man's life, there is no stage at which he can say that he has realised the goal and attained his nature. If God is the nature of man, there is no point in moral progress when the individual can say " I am God." He who conforms to moral rules cannot feel that he has realised his self If moral life were all, the most brilliant career is a futile thing, love a fleeting illusion and happiness an ever-receding goal. St. Paul [1] insists on the impossibility of redemption through the law. Whatever we may do, unless we surrender our selfishness, we cannot be saved. We may fulfil the law of morality from selfish motives, but it has not much moral value. To get rid of the sinfulness of our nature, our avidyā as Śaṁkara calls it, Paul demands faith and Śaṁkara jñāna, which alone lifts us above our finiteness and above the possibility of sin. Salvation is not a question of invention or construction, but of discovery or unveiling. Morality has always a reference to something beyond itself, but jñāna or pure beholding or realisation is complete in itself. It lacks nothing, has no aim or purpose. The śruti declares that the self-existent eternal freedom cannot be achieved by action.[2]

If we remember the sound canon of interpretation, that the best way to arrive at a true meaning of a religious formula is to consider the heresies it is intended to deny, we can appreciate what seems Śaṁkara's unnecessary emphasis on the futility of the karmamārga for the final end of perfection. He felt that the Mīmāṁsakas had bent the bow too much on the side of works by declaring that mere ritualistic formalism was adequate for gaining us freedom of spirit. His denial of the adequacy of works to salvation is a reaction against

[1] *Epistle to the Romans* iii, viii, x, xiii, and the *Epistle to the Galatians* ii and iii.

[2] Nāsty akṛtaḥ kṛtena. Śaṁkara comments akṛto mokṣaḥ kṛtena karmaṇā nāstīti. See also S.B. on Tait. Up., Introduction. Again: " An action is that which is enjoined as being independent of the nature of existing things and dependent on the energy of some person's mind . . . knowledge is the result of the pramāṇas (pramāṇajanyam) which have for their objects existing things and depends entirely on existing things (vastutantram), and not on vedic statements or the mind of man " (S.B., i. 1. 4). See also S.B., ·. 4. 22. The Mādhyamikas regard the equipment of wisdom (jñānasaṁbhāra) as leading to absolute freedom (dharmakāya), while the equipment of merit (puṇyasaṁbhāra) leads to the body of bliss (saṁbhogakāya) (*Mādhyamikāvatāra*, iii. 12). See Keith's *Budd. Ph.*, p. 277.

the exaggerated emphasis which the Mīmāṁsakas place on Vedic ritualism. Ultimate freedom is nothing more than the removal of ajñāna. "The attainment of the highest is merely the removal of avidyā." [1] "On the removal of the ignorance of the nature of Brahman, one abides in one's own self and attains the supreme end." [2] To know Brahman is not to gain an object which we did not possess, but is realising our true nature of which we were unconscious. When avidyā is destroyed, vidyā shines of itself,[3] even as the piece of rope is known when the false notion that it is a snake is refuted.[4] Mere karma, which has for its effect transitory occurrences, cannot lead us to the eternal fact of freedom. Karma cannot dispel avidyā, since the two are not antagonistic. When knowledge is said to precede karma, it is not the highest spiritual insight, but external knowledge of this or that object. Karma is always undertaken for the fulfilment of desire. Mokṣa is incompatible with the presence of desire. Karma has no meaning unless the individual has faith in his own agency and distinguishes the object from himself [5]; but so long as these distinctions subsist, mokṣa is unattainable. "Mokṣa is impossible with a perception of difference, and karma is impossible without a perception of it." [6] The acts performed are expected to yield one of the following results: "Production of a new thing (utpatti), change of state (vikāra), consecration (saṁskāra) and acquisition (āpti)"; mokṣa is none of these.[7] Karma has preparatory value, but it is essentially based on a partial view, and so cannot lead us by itself to the ultimate goal. Jñāna or spiritual insight is the only means to freedom.[8] Śaṁkara insists on this fact sometimes with an unnecessary emphasis. "It is unreasonable to think that the knowledge of Brahman, before which all notions of distinctions of deed, doer, fruit, etc., vanish, can possibly require any extraneous thing as its complement or concomitant

[1] S.B., Muṇḍ. Up., i. 5. Avidyāpaya eva hi parapräptiḥ. Avidyānivṛttir eva mokṣaḥ.

[2] S.B., Tait. Up., Introduction. "Avidyānivṛttau svātmany avasthānam parapräptiḥ.

[3] S.B., iii. 2. 21.

[4] S.B., ii. 1. 14.

[5] S.B., Chān. Up., Introduction.

[6] S.B., Kena Up., Introduction.

[7] S.B., Tait. Up., ii. 11.

[8] *Ātmabodha*, p. 203.

aid in accomplishing it; nor can its fruit of freedom require any such; therefore jñāna cannot consistently with itself require karma as its concomitant help or complement."[1] Śaṁkara admits that the performance of obligatory acts (nityāni karmāṇi) helps us to undo the effects of our past sins, while those who desire specific objects may resort to acts intended to secure their fulfilment (kāmyāni karmāṇi). Both these satisfy the individual with cravings and desires for a time, but neither helps him to reach life eternal. The Mīmāṁsaka holds that, if we avoid interested and forbidden acts, exhaust by enjoyment the fruits of karmas which already have begun to operate, and ward off sins of omission by the performance of obligatory duties, without any other effort, mokṣa can be attained. Śaṁkara says in reply that there are ever so many karmas which have not begun to operate and whose effects cannot be exhausted in one birth; these will involve us in other births, whereby fresh karma will go on accumulating. There is no hope for us until we get rid of the desires which give rise to karma. The desires are traced to avidyā, and so only vidyā, which annihilates avidyā, can take us out of the clutches of karma.[2] Brahmavidyā removes the very basis for these external observances.[3] What counts is not outer conduct but inner life. Its torturing problems cannot be solved by a reference to rules. Our secret hearts, our prayers and meditations help us to solve the problems of life. The highest morality therefore consists in developing the right spirit. The secret of moral genius lies in the spiritualising of our consciousness. Moral life is the necessary result of spiritual insight. Till the latter is gained, moral rules are obeyed in an external fashion.

In another sense, moral obligations are relative to the

[1] See S.B. on Kena Up.

[2] S.B., i. 1. 4. Cp. Plato: "Those who have practised the popular and social virtues which come from habit and practice without philosophy or reason are happiest in the round of transmigration; for it is probable that they return into a mild and social nature like their own, such as that of bees or wasps or ants, or it may be into bodies of men, and that from them are made worthy citizens. But none except the philosopher or the lover of knowledge, who is wholly pure when he goes hence, is permitted to go to the race of the gods" (*Phædo*, p. 82).

[3] Idānīṁ karmopādānahetuparihārāya brahmavidyā prastūyate (S.B., Tait. Up., Introduction).

state of the individual. Morality, in the modern world, is confused with social values, but the latter are not the whole of values. Not only our views of society but our thoughts of God also count. A Robinson Crusoe on a desert island even without Friday can cherish values.

Śaṁkara holds that the knowledge of the inner self is antagonistic to karma, and cannot coexist with it even in a dream. If there are cases recorded in the scriptures where householders performing karma possessed the sacred wisdom and transmitted it to their disciples, Śaṁkara retorts that these statements cannot override an obvious fact, for "the coexistence of light and darkness cannot be brought about even by a hundred rules, much less by mere indications like these."[1] This whole discussion is permeated by the ambiguous usage of the word karma. If karma means activity undertaken by an individual for the fulfilment of this or that private end, it is inconsistent with spiritual insight. Impersonal action, on the other hand, undertaken by an individual after gaining insight for the sake of general ends, does not bind the doer, does not commit him to the life of saṁsāra. Karma, in the former sense, cannot coexist with spiritual insight.[2] If jñāna and karma are opposed as light and darkness, it is karma in the sense of selfish activity and jñāna in the sense of unselfish wisdom. According to Śaṁkara, what the released soul does is not to be called karma. The activity of the liberated soul for world-solidarity (lokasaṁgraha) is not karma strictly speaking. Commenting on the passage of the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* which reads, "sporting in self, delighting in self and daily acts, he is the best of those who know Brahman,"[3] Śaṁkara remarks that the view that the combination of karma and knowledge is allowed by this text is only "the prattle of the ignorant."[4] That some sort of activity is admitted cannot be denied. All that Śaṁkara affirms is that it is not activity which we ordinarily call karma,

[1] Vidyā karmavirodhāc ca na hibrahmātmaikatvadarśanena saha karma svapne 'pi saṁpādayituṁ śakyam . . . yat tu gṛhastheṣu brahmavidyā sampradāyakartṛtvādiliṅgam na tat sthitanyāyam bādhitum utsahate; na hi vidhiśatenāpi tamaḥprakāśayor ekatrasaṁbhavas śakyate kartum. Kimuta liṅgaiḥ kevalair iti (S.B., Muṇḍ. Up., Introduction).

[2] See S.B., Īśa. Up., 18.

[3] iii. 1. 4.

[4] Asatpralapitam evaitat. See also S.B., Chān. Up., Introduction.

for karma is based on egoism.[1] In another passage he says: "To one who knows, no work will cling even if one performs works during his whole life—thanks to the greatness of knowledge."[2] Karma is the name for all activity which leads to continuance of existence in saṁsāra, and this is opposed to true knowledge. The other kind of activity is not to be called karma, since it is not due to kāma or selfish desire. The freed has suppressed his selfish desires (akāmayamāna). On the other hand, in certain passages where his interest is to insist on the freedom of the released soul from the trammels of saṁsāra, he declares that, since all activity is painful in effect, no activity is possible at all for the liberated.[3]

Asceticism is a charge that is frequently levelled against Śaṁkara's ethics. In a hundred ways Śaṁkara urges that there is never anything worthy of pursuit in empirical life.[4] Illness and death come, if not to-day then to-morrow, to ourselves and those whom we love, and nothing remains of all we love on earth but dust and ashes. Nothing on earth can offer a sure foothold for the soul of man. The futility of saṁsāra and attachment to it are indicated in the familiar story of the traveller who, to save himself from the wild beast that is pursuing him, gets into the dried-up well. But at the bottom of the well there is a dragon with its jaws wide open to devour him. He cannot get out for fear of the wild beast, he dare not descend for fear of the dragon, and so he catches hold of a branch of a wild plant growing out of a crevice of the well. He grows tired and feels that he must soon perish. Though death awaits him on either side, he still holds on, clinging fondly to the wild plant, but lo! there are two mice, one black and the other white, gnawing the trunk of the wild plant. It will soon give way and break off and the traveller cannot escape the jaws of death. Even so, we who are

[1] Karmahetuḥ kāma syāt (Tait. Up., S.B., Introduction).

[2] S.B., iii. 4. 14. See also S.B., Chān. Up., ii. 23. 1.

[3] S.B., ii. 3. 40.

[4] Cp. 1 *John* ii. 15–17 "Love not the world, nor yet what is in the world; if anyone loves the world, love for the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the desire of the flesh and the desire of the eyes and the proud glory of life, belongs not to the Father but to the world; and the world is passing away with its desire, while he who does the will of God remains for ever" (Moffatt's E.T.).

travelling on the circuit of saṁsāra know the pitfalls of our life, know that all things to which we cling will inevitably perish, but in spite of it all, we find some drops of honey on the leaves of some wild plant and are busy licking them. Though we know that the dragon of death awaits us, though we know that the white mouse and the black, day and night, are gnawing through the branches to which we cling, we still are tempted by the tree of life. The dragon is there, but that does not matter, the honey is sweet. We take the tree for the truth and do not want to face the terrible fact that nothing in saṁsāra can satisfy the infinite in man. Śaṁkara tells us that the supreme fulfilment is the result and reward of supreme renunciation. It is reached when desire is dead and pleasure and pain alike are cast away. The most perfect virtue and the loftiest intellectual vision are inadequate for the purpose of spiritual perfection. Śaṁkara insists on a life of self-sacrifice and asks us to free ourselves from attachment to the body. The enemy of the soul is not the body as such, but our bondage to the body and the sense of mineness.[1] The released soul before death is possessed of a body, but its presence is not inconsistent with the freedom of spirit. It is because the body in the ordinary individual offers a thousand hindrances to the free growth of the spirit that we find Śaṁkara arguing that the life of the spirit is repressed and hampered by union with the material body. The appearance of asceticism is due to the repeated exhortations to crucify the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof.

It is said that there can be no sense of social life or civic duty in Śaṁkara's world-negating philosophy. There is no need for us to take any interest in the world if it is a lie. Śaṁkara, it is said, insists on redemption from the world and not of it. He does not demand a change of the world, but exhorts us to escape from it. There is no incentive to improve the existing social institutions. That the case is not so bad as it seems is evident from the life of Śaṁkara, which is a standing refutation of the charge that the existent world-order with its institutions is a thing to be escaped from. His whole philosophy refutes the assumption that individuality depends on separateness. Man has to purify himself from the defile-

[1] *Śataślokī*, p. 15.

ments of the world, strip off all clothing, leave behind everything unworthy. He must break away from the slavery of selfhood, passion and sense. A deliberate surrender of all personal feelings and preferences, a self-stripping to the point of apparent nothingness, a " flight of the alone to the alone," means eternal life. The emphasis in Śaṁkara is not on retirement from the world, but on renunciation of the self. It is easier to flee from the world than from the self. Śaṁkara asks us to suppress our selfishness, and, if that requires solitude and retirement, these are advised as means to an end. One who has completely shaken himself free from selfishness is at liberty to take upon himself the task of the world. His attitude will be not world-seeking or world-fleeing, but world-saving. The perfect man lives and dies, not for himself, but for mankind. It is, however, true that Śaṁkara asks us to be in the world but not of it, even as a drop of water is on the lotus leaf without getting mixed up with it. The part of wisdom is to dream with our eyes open, to be detached from the world without any hostility to it.[1]

The criticism that if we interpret mokṣa as the haven of peace, where all life is stilled, consciousness and personality are suppressed, then we can attain to it only by ceasing to be human, takes us beyond our present point to the larger question of the relation of the infinite to the finite, since morality belongs to the system of things finite. Logically, it is the question of the relation of intuition to intellect, spiritual insight to logical knowledge. While the latter depends on the former, we do not know how exactly the two are related. The empirical world depends on Brahman, and we cannot say how. Even so the moral life is related to the spiritual mokṣa ;

[1] Referring to Schopenhauer's statement that " the study of the Upaniṣads has been the solace of my life, it will be the solace of my death," Max Müller says · " Schopenhauer was the last man to write at random, or to allow himself to go into ecstasies over so-called mystic and inarticulate thought. And I am neither afraid nor ashamed to say that I share his enthusiasm for the Vedānta, and feel indebted to it for much that has been helpful to me in my passage through life. After all, it is not everybody who is called upon to take an active part in life, whether in defending or ruling a country, in amassing wealth or breaking stones ; and for fitting men to lead contemplative and quiet lives, I know no better preparation than the Vedānta. A man may be a Platonist and yet a good citizen and an honest Christian, and I should say the same of a Vedāntist ' (S.S., p. 193).

how, we cannot say. To divorce one from the other, intuition from intellect, Brahman from the world, religious realisation from moral life, is to justify the criticism that for Śaṁkara the world is an illusion, our knowledge a lie and our moral life a mockery. But Śaṁkara, again and again, declares that the world has its roots in Brahman. We have to pass through the world of phenomena to get beyond it. As the pathway to the real lies through the phenomenal, the pathway to perfection lies through moral life. Though the end is something in which the ethical as such is transcended, it does not follow that the spiritual has no relation to the ethical. The seeker is nowhere encouraged to give up the duties of the world or devotion to God. The unreality of the moral situation arises only when the function of morality is fulfilled. The final good is not a beyond, while the moral struggle here is a scene of error and failure. It can be realised here and now. To say that the moral effort is relative, is to recognise the element of the ideal in it. The consideration that the distinction of good and evil is relative to our finite level, does not invalidate its observance in the world of practice. The unreality of the distinction has no meaning for those who fetter themselves in chains of selfishness and prolong the misery of finite existence. Śaṁkara does not jettison law altogether, but holds that the approach to freedom lies through the gates of law. Intellect rests on intuition and moral life on spiritual freedom. It is the germ out of which the flower of perfection evolves.

XLII

Karma

The law of karma is assumed by Śaṁkara. Individuality is due to karma, which is a product of avidyā.[1] The kind of world into which we are born is just the return of the works on the doer.[2] The individual organism is the working machinery[3] intended to produce that requital in the form of actions and its results of suffering and happiness. Sometimes

[1] S.B., iii. 2. 9.

[2] Kriyākārakaphalam.

[3] Kāryakāraṇasaṁghāta.

the works of a single existence have to be atoned for in several succeeding ones. Even as the atonement for the past is completed, fresh karma accumulates, "so that the clockwork of atonement in running down always winds itself up again." [1] Moral life is an unremitting active energising, which is never exhausted. It takes endless forms, owing to the variety of the demands of the conditions of human life. This process goes on for ever, until perfect knowledge is gained, which consumes the seed of karma and makes rebirth impossible. Freedom from subjection to the law of karma is the end of human life. To get rid of avidyā is to be freed from the law of karma. But so long as the individual is finite, he is subject to the law of karma, *i.e.* he always strains after an ideal which he never reaches. Morality is a stepping-stone and not a stopping-place. All acts done with an expectation of reward yield their fruits in accordance with the law of karma, while those done with no selfish interest, in the spirit of dedication to God, purify the mind.

It does not, however, follow that we move like marionettes pulled by the strings of our past karma. It has already been said that the individual is responsible for his acts, and God is only the assisting medium, conserving the fruits of his deeds.[2] God does not compel anyone to do this or that. Even those tendencies with which we are bound can be overcome by strength of will.[3] Vaśiṣṭha asks Rāma in *Yogavāśiṣṭha* "to break the chain that holds us in bondage by free effort." [4] The individual has an impulsive nature by virtue of which he has likes and dislikes.[5] Man, if guided by the unformed nature with which he is born, is completely at the mercy of his impulses. So long as his activities are determined by these, they are not free. But man is not a mere sum-total of his impulses. There is the infinite in him. The self as causal power lies outside the empirical series and determines them. The history of man is not a puppet show. It is a creative evolution.

[1] D.S.V., p. 354. [2] S.B., ii. 3. 42. [3] S.B.G., iii. 3. 4.
[4] See *Jīvanmuktiviveka*, ch. i. [5] S.B.G., viii. 18; iii. 33.

XLIII

MOKṢA

Mokṣa is a matter of direct realisation of something which is existent from eternity, though it is hidden from our view. When the limitations are removed, the soul is liberated. It remains where it is, what it is and eternally was, the first principle of all things. It is the peace that the world can never give, nor take away, the supreme and only blessedness. "That which is real in the absolute sense, immutable, eternal, all-penetrating like ākāśa, exempt from all change, all-satisfying, undivided, whose nature is to be its own light, in which neither good nor evil, nor effect, nor past nor present nor future has any place, this incorporeal is called liberation." [1] When avidyā vanishes, the true soul stands self-revealed, even as gold shines when freed from the impurities which affected it, or as the stars shine in a cloudless night, when the day which overpowers them disappears.[2] The enfranchisement of man from all his self-wrought bondages, the glory which is utterly beyond all grasp of thought, the peace that is the very purpose of all our striving, lies nearer to us than our nearest consciousness. Śaṁkara shows us not a heaven which is apart from, a different order of experience from, earth, but the heaven which is all the time here, could we but see it. It is not something in an imagined future, a continuance of existence in a world to come after the present life is ended, but a state of identification with the real here and now.[3]

The freed soul assumes the form of his true self (svātmanyavasthānam).[4] Freedom is not the abolition of self, but the realisation of its infinity and absoluteness by the expansion

[1] Idaṁ tu pāramārthikaṁ, kūṭasthaṁ, nityaṁ, vyomavat sarvavyāpi, sarvavikriyārahitaṁ, nityatṛptaṁ niravayavaṁ svayaṁjyotissvabhāvaṁ, yatra dharmādharmau sahakāryeṇa kālatrayaṁ ca nopāvartate tad aśarīram mokṣākhyam (S.B., i. 1. 4).

[2] S.B., i. 3. 19.

[3] Cp. with this Nāgārjuna's view that nirvāṇa is without origination or cessation, neither one nor many, without motion or absence of motion, neither eternal nor ceasing, and that it is one with saṁsāra (*Mādhyamika Kārikā*, xxv. 19).

[4] S.B., iv. 4. 1–3. Cp. *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*: Ātmany evāvidyānivṛttih.

and illumination of consciousness. Citsukhācārya says that mokṣa is the realisation of all bliss.[1] The essential nature of self as bliss is concealed by pain, bred by ignorance; in the absence of ignorance, pain disappears and the nature of the self as unmixed bliss manifests itself. The realising of mokṣa is not an objective process by which we try to destroy the whole world. It is not "like annihilating the hardness of butter by putting it on the fire.[2] Such a huge undertaking as destroying the world is impossible for a mere man. If the significance of mokṣa be the destruction of the plurality of the world, then the whole world would have been destroyed when the first man attained liberation.[3] The realisation of the truth does not mean the abolition of plurality, but only the removal of the sense of plurality.[4] It is an insight which changes the face of the world and "makes all things new." This insight, this changed attitude to life and its happenings, is not so much a condition of mokṣa as mokṣa itself.[5] The unending procession of the world will go on through its ups and downs, but the liberated man's attachment to it is over.

The word avidyā is intended to bring out the essence of the position. On the attainment of freedom, nothing happens to the world but only our views of it alter. Its fleeting things, which have a bewildering fascination for the unwary, no more trouble the liberated The cause of pain is simply the error of false knowledge,[6] and with deliverance from error comes liberation from pain. Mokṣa is thus not the dissolution of the world but only the disappearance of a false outlook. In his anxiety to make out that the freed soul has no possibility of relapsing into the phenomenal world, Śaṁkara frequently suggests that freedom consists in an entire

[1] Anavacchinnānandaprāpti. S.L.S.

[2] S.B., iii. 2. 21. See also Bṛh. Up., iv. 5. 13.

[3] Ekena cādimuktena pṛthivyādipravilayaḥ kṛta itīdānīm pṛthivyādi śūnyaṁ jagad abhaviṣyat (S.B., iii. 2. 21).

[4] Jñāte dvaitaṁ na vidyate.

[5] Cp. Śuddhabrahmāśrayaviṣayam ekam eva jñānaṁ tannāśa eva ca mokṣaḥ. Kṛṣṇānanda, the commentator on *Siddhāntaleśa*, writes: Caitanyasyājñānasaṁbandho bandhas tadasaṁbandho mokṣo na tu tannivṛttiḥ. Padmapāda holds that mokṣa is the absence of false knowledge. Mithyājñānanivṛttimātram mokṣaḥ.

[6] Mithyābhimānabhramanimitta eva duḥkhānubhavaḥ (S.B., ii. 3. 46).

dissolution of all empirical categories and subject-object distinction.[1]

The criticism that the world is pure illusion finds its support in the view that the world of experience with its distinctions of souls, things and Īśvara, disappears for him who recognises the oneness of Brahman and the Ātman.[2] There are countless passages in Śaṁkara which declare that, as the misconception of the snake disappears on the perception of the rope, as the dream creations vanish on awakening, so also saṁsāra ceases to exist on attaining mukti. The form in which the world appears to our limited insight changes on the realisation of the identity of the soul with Brahman. The things we know as the contents of our environment in this practical life of ours are not present, as such, in the Absolute.[3] Śaṁkara, in different ways, emphasises the fact that the world does not exist for the Absolute in the way in which it exists for us. Bradley is as certain as Śaṁkara that the distinctive nature of appearances does not survive in the Absolute. To use his expression, the appearances are transmuted somehow in the Absolute. How all these are resolved into reality is a "somehow" in Bradley and anirvacanīya in Śaṁkara. Śaṁkara would object to Bradley's use of the word "transmutation." Even the amount of reaction on the imperfect which the word suggests, is inconsistent with the unchanging perfection of the Absolute. It is Śaṁkara's excessive attachment to logical precision that leads him into somewhat misleading statements, to the effect that the world is nought. We are employing intellectual categories when we speak of the "transmutation" of appearances in reality or the "blending" of notes in an eternal harmony. All these, in the opinion of Śaṁkara, attempt to introduce plurality and empirical distinctions into the heart of the Absolute, for which there is no metaphysical warrant. Reality is superior to all relations. The Absolute remains something which we cannot translate into our terms. The relative, as the relative, has no place

[1] Sureśvara says: "When the Infinite Light is intuitively realised, all creatures from Brahmā down to the lowest plant melt into an illusion like unto a dream" (*Mānasollāsa*, i).

[2] Gṛhīte tv ātmaikatve bandhamokṣādisarvavyavahāraparisamāptir eva syāt (S.B., i. 2. 6).

[3] S.B., i. 2. 12; i. 2. 20.

in the Absolute. When that which makes the Absolute into relative is destroyed, what remains is the Absolute. Commenting on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, Śaṁkara observes that the turīya or the fourth (integral experience) is realised by merging the three others (waking, dreaming and dreamless sleep) in it. The highest includes the rest, while transcending them.[1] The phrase used "prapañcopaśamam" means the sinking of the world in Brahman, and not its denial. We possess faculties capable of responding to orders of truth, the use of which would change the whole character of our universe. When we attain to the state of turīya, we shall have reality from another angle, lit by another light; only this angle and this light are absolute. When we apprehend reality from this angle, we see that the reality of the world is the Brahman itself.[2] What we negate is the illusory framework, and what remains is the real in itself.[3] Māyā as concealment has no power over the liberated soul. When the certainty of the oneness of Brahman and the Ātman is reached by anubhava, the tie which binds us to forms is cut, and the forms cease to be attractive on their own account. They may remain and will remain, so long as the senses are alive and intellect operates, but there is no need to connect them with the intuited Brahman. When the illusion of the mirage is dissipated by scientific knowledge, the illusory appearance remains, though it no longer deceives us. We see the same appearance, but give a different value to it. When the illusoriness of the illusion is perceived, it ceases to be an illusion. Whether the forms dissolve themselves in the formless or show themselves to be mere appearances of Brahman, on either view the world is not a mere illusion.

Śaṁkara declares in many passages that the nature of liberation is a state of oneness with Brahman,[4] and even as the latter is lifted above all categories of experience, so the state of mokṣa cannot be described in terms of our knowledge. Since the latter deals with distinctions of space and time, cause and effect, persons and things, action and suffering, it

[1] Trayāṇāṁ viśvādīnām pūrvapūrvapravilāpanena turīyasya pratipattiḥ. Pravilaya suggests merging, and not nirākaraṇa or negation.

[2] S.B., i. 3. 1.

[3] S.B., Māṇḍūkya Up., ii. 7.

[4] Brahmaiva hi muktyavasthā.

is said that none of these distinctions applies to the state of freedom. It cannot be said that the liberated live in a geographical area called svarga or brahmaloka; nor can it be said that they last for endless time. For, Śaṁkara agrees with Aristotle that "endless duration makes good no better, nor white any whiter."[1] We cannot regard the state of mokṣa as one of continuous activity. It is the highest experience where all intellectual activity is transcended and even self-consciousness is obliterated. The soul is lifted above the wheel of the world, the saṁsāracakra, with its perpetual rhythm of growth and decay, birth and rebirth, and achieves that experience of eternity which Boethius defines as "the total and perfect possession of unlimited life at a single moment."[2] Freedom consists in attaining to the state of universal spirit, sarvātmabhāva (literally all-selfness), or Brahman, which is lifted above all distinctions of the empirical world.[3] The state of mokṣa is "none other than one's own inherent nature as Brahman, and is not an acquired state like svarga (paradise) It has been taught in the scriptures (śruti), and even stands to reason, that Brahman is of one nature, and therefore liberation is of one sort, whether obtained by Brahmā or man. The sālokya (or being in the same world as Brahman) and other specific kinds of liberation mentioned, are acquired results, and therefore admit of degrees of excellence according to the quality of worship, but liberation (mukti) is not of that nature."[4] Since Brahman is "present everywhere, within everything and is the self of everything . . . it is altogether impossible that it ever should be the goal of the process of going. For we do not go to what is already reached; experience tells us that a person goes to something different from him."[5] The worshippers of personal God may have to go to Brahmaloka, but not those who have attained mokṣa.[6]

Mokṣa is described negatively as the state of freedom where there is neither day nor night, where the stream of time has

[1] *Nichomachean Ethics*, i. 6.

[2] Quoted in Evelyn Underhill's *Jacopone de Todi*, p. 245.

[3] Sa sarvātmabhāvaḥ sarvasaṁsāradharmātītabrahmasvarūpatvam eva (S.B., Tait. Up., ii. 1).

[4] S.B., iii. 4. 52.

[5] S.B., iv. 3. 14. See also iii. 3. 31.

[6] S.B., iv. 3. 7–8.

stopped, where the sun and the stars are swept away from the sky. The distinctions of knowledge have no force in it.[1] It is like the heaven of the Christians, an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, that fadeth not away. But it does not follow that it is a state of utter blankness. The freed soul does not see another, but sees himself in all.[2] Even as Brahman seems from our empirical point of view a mere nothing, so the state of mokṣa seems to be a dead loss, a fading into forgetfulness, a putting out the light and melting away into non-existence, of the type suggested by George Eliot in *The Legend of Jubal* :—

> Quitting mortality, a quenched sun-wave,
> The All-creating Presence for his grave.

As Śaṁkara protests that Brahman seems non-existent only to the feeble-minded, so he argues that, from our empirical point of view, this becoming one with the great All *seems* to be a sinking into death and not rising into life, but, strictly speaking, it is not that. There are even passages which make out that on the attainment of mokṣa there is consciousness. Taking one such, Śaṁkara argues that individual consciousness (viśeṣavijñāna) disappears in it and not all consciousness. The pure substance of Ātman (vijñānaghanātmā) remains.[3] Similarly, he holds that only limiting adjuncts are destroyed in mokṣa, and not the Ātman itself.[4] Mokṣa is not vanishing into a waste. To us, from our limited view-point, the soul with its outlook confined to the body, the senses, the mind and the understanding, is the real ; and the liberated soul which has realised its oneness with the universal self, has conquered time, and reached life eternal, seems to be unreal. We demand an immortal life in the sense of continued personal existence. Śaṁkara grants it to the soul whose outlook does not go beyond the body, the senses and the mind. Only he regards such a soul as a mere particular, a phenomenon

[1] Darśanādivyahahārābhāva (S.B., i. 3. 9).

[2] Muktasyāpi sarvaikatvāt samāno dvitīyābhāvaḥ (S.B., Chān. Up., viii. 12. 3).

[3] S.B., i. 4. 22. He also quotes Bṛh. Up., iv. 3. 30, in S.B., i. 3. 19, and comments thus : " Viśeṣavijñānavināśābhiprāyam eva, na vijñātṛvināśābhiprāyam."

[4] Upādhipralayam evāyaṁ nātmapralayam (ii. 1. 14).

among phenomena that arise and pass away. But when everything that characterises the finite as finite vanishes, when the body which is the symbol of finitude is shaken off, *i.e.* when the finite is raised to the infinite level, we reach the true state of blessedness even here and now. What is positively its content it is difficult to describe. Of it, it is true, that eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered the heart of man, to conceive the glory that shall be revealed. Yet, if mokṣa is to have any significance for us, we must clothe the idea of immortality in the language of time and call it sarvātmabhāva, all-selfness.[1]

Similarly there are passages where Śaṁkara declares that the true nature of the individual is that of the highest lord, " The self of the highest Lord is the real nature of the embodied soul ; and the state of embodiment is due to the limiting adjuncts."[2] " Even as the imagined serpent becomes a rope after the removal of avidyā, so the apparent individual soul which is stained by agency and experience, love and hate and other imperfections, and is subject to much that is evil, is transformed through wisdom to the sinless essence of the highest God, opposed to all these imperfections."[3] Appaya Dīkṣita quotes this passage and remarks that Śaṁkara evidently supports the view of mokṣa as oneness with Īśvara[4] which he himself adopts.[5]

The freed soul is said to be indistinguishable (avibhāga) from the highest.

This indistinguishableness is interpreted in various ways. Jaimini[6]

[1] Sarvātmabhāvo mokṣa uktaḥ (S.B., Bṛh. Up., iv. 4. 6).

[2] Pārameśvaram eva hi śarīrasya pāramārthikaṁ svarūpam, upādhikṛtaṁ tu śārīratvam (iii. 4. 8). Again : Evam mithyājñānakṛta eva jīvaparameśvarayor bhedo na vastukṛto vyomavad asaṁgatvāviśeṣāt (S.B., i. 3. 19). See also S.B., Īśa. Up., 14.

[3] Yad avidyāpratyupasthāpitam apāramārthikaṁ jaivaṁ rūpaṁ kartṛtvabhoktṛtvarāgadveṣādidoṣakaluṣitam anekānarthayogi tadvilayanena, tadviparītam, apahatapāpmatvādiguṇakam pārameśvaraṁ svarūpaṁ vidyayā pratipādyate, sarpādivilayaneneva rajjvādīn (S.B., i. 3. 19). See *Kalpataru* and *Parimala* on it.

[4] Bhāṣyakāro 'py atispaṣṭam muktasya saguṇeśvarabhāvāpattim āha.

[5] See *Siddhāntaleśa*, iv. It is suggested that, according to the anekajīvavāda, mukti is oneness with Īśvara until all are liberated, when it becomes identity with Brahman. See *Siddhāntaleśa*, iv, and Kṛṣṇānanda's *Vyākhyā* on it.

[6] S.B., iv. 4. 5. See also Chān. Up., viii. 1. 6 ; viii. 7. 1.

" while producing the entire world as an object of fruition for the individual souls, in agreement with their respective good and evil deserts, creates certain things of such a nature as to become common objects of consciousness, while certain other things are created in such a way as to be perceived only by particular persons and to persist for a limited time only. It is this distinction of things that are objects of general consciousness and those that are not so which makes the difference between what is called ' things sublating ' and ' things sublated.' "[1] It is a mistake to think that some cognitions have false things for their objects and others true ones.

Rāmānuja's view seems to explain away all error. While he maintains that all knowledge is of the real, he does not say that knowledge is of the whole of reality. Our knowledge is generally imperfect and partial. When we mistake a piece of shell for silver, we notice certain features and miss others. In the illusion of the " yellow " conch we fail to notice the whiteness of the conch. In dream experiences we overlook the fact that the objects are private and peculiar to the dreamer and not to others. Even in what is generally taken as true knowledge we ignore much that is unnecessary for practical purposes. While both true and erroneous knowledge are incomplete, the former takes note of the features necessary for the interests in view and serves our needs; the latter fails to achieve the end in view. True knowledge is useful in life. The mirage is an error, not because the element of water is not present in it, but because the water in it does not quench our thirst. The true is what represents the real (yathārtha) and what is practically useful (vyavahārānuguṇa).[2]

While all knowledge is representative of some aspects of reality, it is not complete and perfect until it takes in the whole of reality. The possibility of error is not removed until our knowledge becomes complete and comprehensive, and the individual knower is freed from all defects. In saṁsāra this is not possible, though the aspiration is there.

Rāmānuja believes in an immanent necessity operating in the nature of knowledge. It is this necessity which enables

[1] i. 1. 1. [2] *Yatīndramatadīpikā.*

the indeterminate cognition to pass over into the determinate. Throughout, our judgments attempt to relate the subjects to the larger whole. When knowledge is at its highest, *i.e.* when it reaches its goal, we shall have a single organised experience including a number of parts with their specific functions. In such a whole each member would be characterised by its own place and function, and, though finite, would be none the less individual and unique. The jīva, when freed, attains the ideal of perfect knowledge.

Śaṁkara is quite right in thinking that a bare identity cannot be grasped by thought, but thought need not be blamed for not achieving the impossible. If the subject is a simple self-identity, then the judgment which asserts that S is P is not true, for we can only say S is S. Significant predication is false, and tautological judgment is useless. But Rāmānuja asserts that while the judgment affirms the identity of the subject with the predicate, there is another equally important factor, that the subject and the predicate are different. There can be no judgment unless there be an identity maintaining itself through the different aspects of things, but the identity must manifest itself in difference and overcome it. Identity is a relation, and every relation requires two terms. If the terms are not distinct, they cannot be related. The negation of all difference renders impossible even the relation of identity. In absolute self-sameness there cannot be any talk of identity. Even when we say S is S, we make such a proposition only in answer to a suggested difference. Śaṁkara argues that when we say "That art thou" there is the *apparent difference* between the two, and the judgment asserts the *real identity* between them. But Rāmānuja contends that identity and difference apply to terms which are on the same level of reality. All identity is an identity in and through difference, and every judgment is an illustration of it. In "the sky is blue," "the sky" and "blue" are not identical; nor are they completely different. The object and the property of blueness subsist together, though the two have different significations. The relational view of thought is best adapted to the exposition of the nature of reality, since the real is a perfect system determined by and determining its contents. It is a false standard of intelli-

gibility that regards the rational nature of thought as a defect. Knowledge, to be knowledge, must unfold and develop the system of relations through which it asserts its own existence. The active living principle is what inwardly distinguishes itself and yet remains free in so doing. Śaṁkara holds that a system of relations leads to an infinite regress. A relation implies two terms which, with the relation itself, make three; and if we add to them the mutual relations of them to one another, we are forced to an infinite regress. Rāmānuja rejects this view in favour of a dynamic reality, which has in it the possibility of self-revelation. He does not believe that there are no relations where there is oneness, and where there are relations there is no oneness. The world for knowledge is an orderly whole, the detailed development or expression of a single principle. God and the world are equally real, and each must be real through the other; and this is possible only if we regard the system as a single experience of the personal type. Thought reaches the full apprehension of God as self-conscious intelligence. Reality is an individual of which the elements are the lesser individuals.

IX

Cause and Substance

Rāmānuja adopts the theory of satkāryavāda. Every effect implies a pre-existent material cause. Alteration of state is the meaning of causation.[1] Threads are the cause of cloth, for cloth is only a cross arrangement of threads.[2] Existence and non-existence are different states of a substance. Non-existence is only relative and not absolute.

Whatever has qualities is a substance or dravya. The basis (ādhāra) is the substance, and what depends on it (ādheya) is the non-substance (adravya). While things are dravyas, attributes and relations are adravyas. The lamp is a substance, so also the light (prabhā), though the latter is also a guṇa or a quality. Buddhi is a substance, as it has

[1] Avasthāntarāpattir eva hi kāryatā (R.B.G., xiii. 2).
[2] R.B., ii. 1. 19–20. See also ii. 1. 16.

the quality of being subject to expansion and contraction; it is also a quality of the self.[1] The whole world as the viśeṣaṇa (adjective) of God is non-substantial (adravya) from the standpoint of Īśvara though it contains dravya and adravya as elements and qualities. A viśeṣaṇa may be a substance like jñāna. While substances serve as the material cause, non-substances cannot do so.[2] The substances are prakṛti or matter, kāla or time, śuddhasattva or pure matter, dharmabhūtajñāna or attributive consciousness, jīva or the individual soul, and Īśvara or God.[3] While the first three are unconscious (jaḍa), God and the soul are conscious (ajaḍa), and jñāna has the features of both. It is unlike unconscious substances since it can manifest itself and external objects. Knowledge, however, is never for itself, but is always for another, the self. Knowledge is a unique adjunct of the self, and is called dharmabhūtajñāna. The self knows this or that object when the jñāna issues forth through this or that sense and comes into contact with an object. It is assumed that subjects and objects exist independently and are brought into relation with each other by means of knowledge.

The five qualities of sound, resistance, form, taste and smell, cohesion, quantity, number, magnitude, individuality, conjunction, distinction, as well as desire, aversion, pleasure, pain and will and understanding, are non-substances.

X

Self and Consciousness

Śaṁkara believes that the distinction between subject and object is a relative one, since the real is the one undifferenced Brahman. Rāmānuja disputes this view, and holds that the nature of consciousness testifies to the existence of a permanent thinking subject, as well as objects distinct from the self.[4] Knowledge involves the perception of difference. There is no source of knowledge enabling us to apprehend mere undifferenced being. Even if there were, it would place Brahman in the position of an object, and thus involve

[1] *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, iv. 7.
[2] *Ibid.*, v. 2.
[3] *Ibid.*, i. 6.
[4] Na ca nirviṣayā kācit saṁvid asti.

it in the sphere of the perishable. There cannot be such a thing as pure consciousness. This is either proved or not. If pure consciousness is proved to be real, it follows that it has attributes; if it is not, then it is non-existent, like a sky flower.[1] Even Śaṁkara attributes to consciousness qualities like eternity, self-luminousness. Knowledge, to be sure, is self-luminous (svayaṁprakāśa), but it is also an object of knowledge (vedya). It is not necessary that everything known must be a non-conscious (jaḍa) object.

If knowledge were unlimited, its objects also should be so, which is, however, not the case. It is a mistake to think that knowledge exists in deep sleep and similar states, as pure knowledge devoid of any objects. "For a person risen from deep sleep never represents to himself his state of consciousness during sleep in the form 'I was pure consciousness, free from all egoity and opposed in nature to everything else, witnessing nescience (ajñāna).' What he thinks is only 'I slept well.' From this form of reflection it appears that even during sleep the self, *i.e.* the 'I,' was a knowing subject and perceptive of pleasure. Even when the self says that it was 'conscious of nothing,' it means that the knowing 'I' persisted, and what is negated is the objects of knowledge."[2] Jñāna is not known except in relation to an object, and, in deep sleep, it does not function, since there is no object. The soul, in deep sleep, remains in its intrinsic state of self-consciousness along with the jñāna, which is not functioning at the moment. The self is always an ego and never pure knowledge. Śaṁkara admits as much when he says that the self exists in deep sleep as the witness (sākṣin) of the general nescience, though the organ of egoity (ahaṁkāra) is dissolved. But that which does not know cannot be a witness (sākṣin). Pure knowledge is not a witness. Sākṣin is a knower, *i.e.* a subject. This subject persists even in deep sleep, only we are not conscious of it, since it is overpowered by tamas. If it did not persist in deep sleep, we could not remember that we slept well on waking from sleep. But for this permanent self memory would be impossible, and we could not

[1] Saṁvit siddhyati vā na vā, siddhyati cet sadharmatā syāt, na cet tuccatā gaganakusumādivat (i. 1. 1).

[2] i. 1. 1. See also ii. 3. 31.

recognise anything to-day as something we had seen yesterday. Even if consciousness were identified with the conscious subject and acknowledged as permanent, the phenomenon of recognition would not be easily explained. For it implies a conscious subject persisting from the earlier to the later moment, and not merely consciousness.[1] The self is not self-luminous knowledge, but only the subject of it. We do not say " I am consciousness," [2] but only " I am conscious." [3] The self-luminous character of knowledge is derived from the self or the knower. The existence of knowledge and its self-luminous character depend on its connection with a self.[4] To argue that the subject, thus established, belongs to the side of the object is " no better than to maintain that one's own mother is a barren woman." We cannot attribute to self-sense (ahaṁkāra), which is a non-intelligent effect of prakṛti, knowership any more than knowledge. The self is of the essence of knowledge, and has knowledge also for its quality.[5] It is a knower and not mere light.[6] We need not think that to be a knower is to be essentially changing. For to be a knower is to be the substrate of the quality of knowledge; and, since the knowing self is eternal, knowledge, which is its quality, is also eternal. Only this eternal knowledge does not manifest itself always. Knowledge, which is in itself unlimited (svayam aparicchinnam), is capable of contraction and expansion. Owing to the influence of karma, it becomes contracted when it adapts itself to work of different kinds and is variously determined by the different senses. With reference to these adaptations due to the senses, it is said to rise and vanish. It never ceases to be, though it functions, throughout life, in a more or less restricted manner. But since the quality of adaptation is not essential and is brought about by action, the self is regarded as essentially unchanging.[7]

[1] Pratisaṁdhānaṁ hi pūrvaparakālasthāyinam anubhavitāram upasthāpayati, nānubhūtimātram (i. 1. 1).

[2] Anubhūtir aham.

[3] Anubhavāmy aham.

[4] i. 1. 1. See also ii. 3. 18.

[5] Cidrūpa . . . caitanyaguṇaka.

[6] Jñātaiva na prakāśamātram. See also Bṛh. Up., iv. 3. 7 and 14; iv. 5. 15; Chān., viii. 12. 3 and 4; viii. 26. 2; Praśna, iv. 9; vi. 5; Tait., ii. 4.

[7] i. 1. 1.

Rāmānuja disputes the view that consciousness is never an object. Though it is not an object when it illumines other things, it can and does frequently become an object. For common observation shows that the consciousness of one person becomes the object of the cognition of another, as when we infer something from the friendly or unfriendly appearance of another, or when one's past states of consciousness become the objects of his present cognition. Consciousness does not lose its nature simply because it becomes an object of consciousness. We cannot say that consciousness is self-proved. For Rāmānuja the essential nature of consciousness consists in its manifesting itself at the present moment through its own being to its substrate, or in being instrumental in proving its own object by its own being.[1] When unconscious things are revealed, they are not revealed to themselves. The other attributes of the self, such as atomic extension, eternity and so on, and the past states of consciousness, are revealed not through themselves, but through an act of knowledge different from them.[2]

XI

God

From Rāmānuja's theory of knowledge, it follows that the real cannot be a bare identity. It is a determinate whole, which maintains its identity in and through the differences. While Rāmānuja is clear that there exists an absolute self, he is equally clear that every finite reality is an expression of this self. To make reciprocal interaction among a plurality of existents possible, the constituent elements of the world-whole must have a common bond of unity :
which must be a spiritual principle. Not only logic, but religious experience, demands a conservation of the finite and an admission of the infinite as a personal being. The sense of personal communion with God involves a real fellowship with an "other," divine personality. The nirguṇa Brahman,

[1] Anubhūtitvaṁ nāma vartamānadaśāyāṁ svasattayaiva svāśrayam pratiprakāśamānatvaṁ, svasattayaiva svaviṣayasādhanatvaṁ vā (i. 1. 1).

[2] See *Śrutaprakāśikā*.

which stares at us with frozen eyes regardless of our selfless devotion and silent suffering, is not the god of religious insight. Śaṁkara's method, according to Rāmānuja, leads him to a void, which he tries to conceal by a futile play of concepts. His nirguṇa Brahman is a blank, suggesting to us the famous mare of Orlando, which had every perfection except the one small defect of being dead. Such a Brahman cannot be known by any means, perception, inference, or scripture.[1] If the sources of knowledge are all relative, they cannot tell us of something which transcends experience; if the scriptures are unreal, even so is the Brahman of which they relate. In the ultimate reality called God we have determination, limitation, difference, other-being which is at the same time dissolved, contained and gathered together in the one. Finitude is in the infinite itself. Brahman has internal difference (svagatabheda) and is a synthetic whole, with souls and matter as his moments (cidacidviśiṣṭa).[2] The qualities of being (sat), consciousness (cit), and bliss (ānanda) give to Brahman a character and a personality. Brahman's knowledge is immediate, and is not dependent on the organs of sense.[3] He is all-knowing and has direct intuition of all. Brahman is the supreme personality, while the individuals are personal in an imperfect way. Personality implies the power to plan and realise one's purposes. God is perfect personality, since he contains all experience within himself and is dependent on nothing external to him. The differences necessary for personality are contained within himself. The most prominent qualities of God are knowledge, power and love (karuṇa). Out of his love God has created the world, established laws, and helps constantly all who seek to attain perfection.[4] While each quality by itself is different from the others, they all belong to one identity and do not divide its integrity of being. The Lord's connection with them is natural (svābhāvika) and eternal (sanātana).[5] These attributes are said to be abstract, as distinct from matter and souls, which are also called the attributes of God. Īśvara is the support (ādhāra) of his own essential qualities, as well as

[1] i. 1. 2. [2] i. 1. 2; S.D.S., iv. [3] i. 2. 19.
[4] *Rahasyatrayasāra*, xxiii. [5] R.B., i. 1. 15.

those of the objects dependent on him.[1] The Supreme has "a divine form peculiar to itself, not of the stuff of prakṛti and not due to karma."[2] A body is not a mere combination of the elements or something which is sustained by prāṇa or life-breath. It is not the seat of the senses or the cause of pleasure-pain. It is, according to Rāmānuja, "any substance which a conscious soul is capable of completely controlling and supporting for its own purposes, and which stands to the soul in an entirely subordinate relation."[3] Though embodied, God does not suffer, seeing that karma, and not embodiedness, is the cause of suffering.[4] He is the Lord of karma, for the latter by itself cannot give rise to the consequences. Action, which is non-intelligent and transitory, is incapable of bringing about a result connected with a future time.[5] It is the supreme Lord that bestows the different forms of enjoyment in this and the heavenly world. We may say also that Brahman is devoid of form,[6] though connected with various forms, for "the individual soul is connected with the shape of the body in which it dwells, since it participates in the pleasures and pains to which the body gives rise; but, since Brahman does not share these pleasures and pains, it has no form."[7] Brahman is not touched by the suffering of souls or the mutations of matter. All evil is the result of past wrong, the product of the soul's life in saṁsāra. God is in no way responsible for it. Above the endless succession of existences, he dwells in light, where no shadow can dim his glory.[8] Such a life is possible for the liberated spirits also; much more therefore for God.[9]

Souls and matter are comprehended within the unity of Lord's essence and are related to the Supreme as attributes to a substance, as parts to a whole, or as body to the soul[10] which animates it. They are also called prakāras or modes, śeṣas or accessories, niyāmya[11] or the controlled, while God

[1] *Rahasyatrayasāra*, iii.
[2] i. 2. 1.
[3] ii. 1. 9.
[4] i. 1. 21.
[5] iii. 2. 37.
[6] Brahmarūparahitatulyam eva.
[7] iii. 2. 14.
[8] i. 1. 21.
[9] iii. 3. 27.
[10] Cp. Jagat sarvaṁ śarīram te. *Rāmāyaṇa* Yuddhakāṇḍa, i. 20. 26; *Tiruvāymoyi*, i. 1. 8; Bṛh. Up., v. 7.
[11] Niyāmyatvam is defined by Vedānta Deśika as "tatsaṁkalpādhina. sattāsthitipravṛttikatvam."

is the supporter (prakāri), controller (niyantā) and the principal (śeṣi).[1] They are real and permanent, though subject to the control of the one Brahman in all their modifications and evolutions. The relation of body to soul is said to bring out roughly the nature of the dependence of the world on God. Since the body (śarīra) decays when the soul departs, it has only derivative being; the movements of the body are subject to the will of the soul.[2] The world stands in the same relation to God, deriving its being from him and subject to his will.[3] Īśvara exists, with the jīva as his inner and the world as his outer body. If souls and matter are attributes of God, it does not mean that they are not in themselves substances possessing attributes, with their own distinct modes, energies and activities. The illustration of the soul and body points out that the body has its own qualities, though it qualifies the soul. This hypothesis enables Rāmānuja to account for the harmony of the universe and the interaction of the reals, so as to form one world. The world is one on account of the supreme mind which gives organic connection to the multiplicity of spiritual reals and a place and a function to each of them. Souls (bhoktā), matter (bhogya), and God (preritā)[4] are three, on account of their natural differences (svarūpabheda), but one on account of the identity (aikyam) of the modes and substance (prakāra and prakāri).[5] Identity means only inseparable existence (apṛthaksiddhi).

Rāmānuja's conception of God is not that of a merely last term in an ascending series of real reflective self-conscious individuals, nor that of a merely transcendental Absolute existing above and beyond the finite universe. While the conscious and the unconscious objects of the universe coexist with God, they yet derive their existence from him and are sustained through him. The pluralistic universe is real in precisely the same sense as God is real. The universe, however, depends on God as its ground, its *ratio essendi*, but not as its cause. God is not to be regarded as simply the immanent ground, for then God will have to be conceived as wholly differentiated into the "many," or the "many" will have to

[1] iii; R.B., ii. 4. 14.
[2] Svarūpāśritam. Saṁkalpādhīnam.
[3] Īśvarasya rūpāśritam and icchādhīnam.
[4] Śvet. Up., i.
[5] Brahman is prakāraviśiṣṭaprakāri.

be conceived as wholly absorbed into the undifferentiated oneness of God. To Rāmānuja, God is both the transcendent and the immanent ground of the world. God is a person, and not a mere totality of other persons, and so he cannot be confused with the thinking individuals and the objects of their thought.

God, from within the cosmic order, sustains it as its ultimate ground and support, and receives it back on its dissolution.[1] Creation and dissolution are not to be taken as events in time, but are to be interpreted as signifying logical dependence on the one Supreme. Brahman alone is uncaused, while all the rest is caused.[2] Though he is responsible for the world, which is imperfect, he is not touched by its imperfections. The supreme spirit is identified with Viṣṇu by Rāmānuja, and the highest attributes are ascribed to him. Brahmā and Śiva are also Viṣṇu.[3]

The divine spirit can be envisaged in several ways. "Brahman" may denote the central unity when souls and matter are regarded as its attributes, or the combined whole when the real is said to be Brahman and Brahman alone. Brahman is the supreme reality, of which the world is the body or the attribute (viśeṣaṇa). This world may be manifest, as in creation, or unmanifest, as in pralaya. Even in the latter condition the attributes of souls and matter exist, though subtly. The condition of absolute liberation for all is the consummation of the world. It is the ideal aimed at by the process of the universe. When it is realised, the souls regain their innocence and exist in heaven facing God. Even nature displays its sattva form. This ideal world is inherent in God. It is a state already individualised. This condition cannot be identified with the state of souls and matter in pralaya. Apart from the world-body, Īśvara has an ideal materiality, a sort of plastic stuff, through which he displays his boundless power of appearing diverse and multiple, though he is inwardly one and the same. Yet his essence is to be distinguished from this nityavibhūti also.

[1] i. 1. Cp. *Tiruvāymoyi*, x. 5. 3. Rāmānuja's philosophy is called Viśiṣṭādvaitam for the reason, among others, that it insists on the non-duality of two different objects, viśiṣṭayor advaitam.

[2] ii. 3. 9.

[3] Cp. *Tiruvāymoyi*, x. 10. 1.

Rāmānuja supports his conception of reality from the scriptures. The Vedas declare that Brahman is full of auspicious qualities. "Truth, knowledge and infinite is Brahman," says the Upaniṣad. These several terms refer to the one supreme reality and declare that the absolute Brahman is unchangeable perfection, and possesses intelligence which is ever uncontracted, while the intelligence of released souls was for some time in a contracted condition. It is infinite (anantam), since its nature is free from all limitations of place, time and substance, and different in kind from all other things. Infinity characterises the qualities as well as the nature of Brahman, which is not the case with regard to the souls called eternal (nitya).[1] It is first without a second, since there is no other God than God. Rāmānuja admits that there are texts which deny all predicates to Brahman, but contends that they only deny finite and false attributes, and not all attributes whatsoever. When it is said that we cannot comprehend the nature of Brahman, it only means that the glory of Brahman is so vast that it eludes the grasp of the finite mind. The texts which deny plurality are explained as intended to deny the real existence of things apart from the supreme spirit which is identical with all things. The supreme spirit subsists in all forms as the soul of all (sarvasyātmatayā). In the highest intuition the Upaniṣads declare that "one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, and knows nothing else" than Brahman. Rāmānuja explains that "when the meditating devotee realises the intuition (anubhava) of Brahman, which consists of absolute bliss, he does not see anything apart from it, since the whole aggregate of things is contained within the essence (svarūpa) and outward manifestation (vibhūti) of Brahman.[2] Rāmānuja interprets the famous text, "Tat tvam asi," in accordance with his view of knowledge. Śaṁkara is of opinion that the passage, "That art thou," is intended to bring out the metaphysical identity between Brahman and the individual soul, when their special characteristics are ignored. In the judgment, "This is that Devadatta," the idea conveyed is of Devadatta and him alone. To understand the identity

[1] Deśakālavastuparicchedarahitam . . . sakaletaravastuvijātīyam (i. 1. 2).
[2] i. 3. 7.

between S and P we must eliminate thisness and thatness. Until we do so, S and P are never identical, and the sentence would be affirming a contradiction. So the text, "That art thou," means the absolute oneness of Brahman and the individual soul, which we should realise when we drop the imagined distinctions produced by avidyā. Rāmānuja argues against this contention and holds that every judgment is a synthesis of distincts. When Brahman and the individual soul are placed in the relation of subject and predicate (sāmānādhikaraṇya),[1] it follows that there is a difference between the two. Subject and predicate are *distinct* meanings referred to the *same* substance. If the two meanings cannot coinhere in the same substance, the judgment fails. We distinguish subject and predicate in their meaning or intension, but unite them in their application or extension. So the text, "That art thou," brings out the complex nature of the ultimate reality, which has individual souls inhering in it.[2] Brahman and the jīva are related as substance and attribute (viśeṣa and viśeṣaṇa), or soul and body.[3] If there were not a difference between the two, we could not say that the one is the other. There are statements recorded in the scripture where the mystic soul identifies himself with the supreme and calls on others to worship him. Indra's statement, "Meditate on me," and Vāmadeva's declaration, "I am Manu, I am Sūrya," are interpreted by Rāmānuja as affirming the view that Brahman is the inner self of all (sarvāntarātmatvam).[4] Since the infinite one dwells in all, he may be said to dwell in any individual, and so one can say with Prahlāda that as Brahman "constitutes my 'I' also, all is from me, I am all, within me is all."[5] All words, directly or indirectly, refer to Brahman.[6]

[1] Samānam = ekam, adhikaraṇam = viśeṣaṇānām ādhārabhūtaṁ viśeṣyam.

[2] See also ii. 1. 23.

[3] Jīvaparamātmanoḥ śarīrātmabhāvena tādātmyaṁ na viruddham. See *Vedārthasaṁgraha*, pp. 32, 35, 44 and 110.

[4] i. 1. 31.

[5] *Viṣṇu P.*, i. 19. 85, quoted in R.B., i. 1. 31.

Sarvagatvād anantasya sa evāham avasthitaḥ
Mattas sarvam ahaṁ sarvam mayi sarvaṁ sanātane.

[6] *Vedārthasaṁgraha*, p. 30.

The Vaiṣṇava theology is based on the Vedas and the Āgamas, the Purāṇas and the Prabandham. The Vedas speak of the Absolute in itself and the inner ruler. The Pañcarātra Āgamas accept the theory of Vyūhas or manifestations. The Purāṇas inculcate the worship of the avatārs, such as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. The Drāviḍa Prabandham is full of devotional utterances addressed to the images in the shrines of South India. So it is said that the one Absolute identified with Viṣṇu exists in five different modes, images and the like (arcā), incarnations (vibhava), manifestations (vyūha) like Saṁkarṣaṇa, Vāsudeva, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, the subtle (sūkṣma) form of Vāsudeva or the supreme spirit and the inner ruler of all (antaryāmin). Sometimes the highest mode (para) is said to be Nārāyaṇa or Brahman living in Vaikuṇṭha,[1] where God is said to exist in a body made of pure sattva. God in his infinite fulness transcends his own manifestations. The perfect personality of God is not exhausted in its cosmical aspects. God has his own independent life, rendering possible personal relations with him. In Vaikuṇṭha, the Lord is seated on the serpent Śeṣa, supported by his consort Lakṣmī. Lakṣmī, the imaginative symbol of the creative energy of God, becomes in later Vaiṣṇavism the divine mother of the universe, who sometimes intercedes with God on behalf of weak and erring humanity. She is the power united eternally with the Lord. While Īśvara symbolises justice, Lakṣmī stands for mercy, and the two qualities are united in the godhead. Lakṣmī, the śakti of Viṣṇu, has the two forms of kriyā or the principle of regulation and control, and bhūti or the principle of becoming. These, answering to force and matter, enable Viṣṇu to become the efficient and the material causes of the universe. The Supreme has the six perfections of knowledge, energy, strength, lordship, vigour and brilliance.[2] While the highest spirit Vāsudeva possesses all the six perfections, the three other vyūhas possess only two of these. The vyūhas, according to Rāmānuja, are the forms which the highest Brahman assumes out of tenderness for his devotees. They are respectively the rulers of individual souls (Saṁkarṣaṇa), minds (Pradyumna) and egoity (Aniruddha).[3] The Vibhavarūpas are the incarnations of Viṣṇu. In his Introduction to the *Gītābhāṣya*, Rāmānuja says that God in his infinite mercy "assumed various forms without putting away his own essential godlike nature, and time after time incarnated himself . . . descending not only with the purpose of relieving the burden of the earth, but also to be accessible to men, even such as we are, so revealing himself to the world as to be visible to the sight of all, and doing such other marvellous deeds as to ravish the hearts and eyes of all beings, high and low." Rāmānuja's God is not an impassive absolute who looks down upon us from the height of heaven, but joins us in the experiences of our life, shares our ends and works for the

[1] Parabrahmaparavāsudevādivācyo nārāyaṇaḥ (*Yatīndramatadīpikā*).
[2] See also *Viṣṇu P.*, vi. 5. 79.
[3] R.B., ii. 2. 40.

upbuilding of the world. The avatārs are literally the descents from the supernatural (aprākṛta) to the natural (prākṛta) order. They are principal (mukhya) or subordinate (gauṇa). When Viṣṇu himself interferes with the natural order, we have a case of the former; the inspired souls[1] are the subordinate incarnations. The avatārs are worshipped by the seeker for freedom, while the latter are resorted to by those who desire wealth, power and influence. God dwells in duly consecrated images (pratimā or vigraha). *Arthapañcaka* speaks of the suffering which the Lord out of his love for men undergoes in permitting himself to be embodied in an idol.[2] God, as the antaryāmin, dwells in all beings and accompanies the soul in all its wanderings through heaven and hell. The God in man is like a flash of lightning in the heart of a blue cloud.[3] God, as antaryāmin, is said to be the highest of all.[4]

XII

The Individual Soul

The absoluteness of God is qualified in Rāmānuja so as to admit of the existence, within the scope of his universal activity, of free spirits, who, though they draw all they are from God, yet possess such spontaneity and choice that they deserve to be called persons. Rāmānuja wages a vigorous and telling polemic against those who regard persons as vain variations of the self-same absolute. The individual soul, through a mode of the supreme, is real, unique, eternal, endowed with intelligence and self-consciousness, without parts, unchanging, imperceptible and atomic.[5] It is different from the body, the senses, vital breath, and even buddhi. It is the knower, the agent (kartā) and the enjoyer (bhoktā). It is attached, on the human plane, to the gross body, the vital

[1] Āveśāvatāras.

[2] "Though omniscient, he appears as ignorant, though spirit as non-spirit, though his own master as one who is in the power of men, though omnipotent as powerless, though entirely free from needs as having needs, though all-protecting as helpless, though lord like servant, though invisible as visible, though unseizable as seizable."

[3] Nīlatoyadamadhyasthā vidyullekheva bhāsvara (in *Vedārthasaṁgraha*).

[4] Cp. *Pañcarātrarahasya*.

Pūrvapūrvoditopāsti viseṣakṣīṇakalmaṣaḥ.
Uttarottaramūrtīnām upāstyadhikṛto bhavet.

See S.D.S., iv.

[5] ii. 2. 19–32; ii. 3. 18. *Yatīndramatadīpikā*, viii.

breath, which is an instrument as much as the sense organs,[1] the five organs of action and manas. Manas reveals to the soul the inner states and, with the aid of the senses, conveys a knowledge of the outer states. The functions of manas are threefold: decision (adhyavasāya), self-love (abhimāna), and reflection (cintā).[2] The atomic jīva has its seat in the hṛtpadma. In deep sleep it rests in it and in the highest self.[3] Sleep is not a breach of the continuity of the self, as is evident from the continuity of work, from the fact of memory, from the statements of scripture, and from the adequacy of the hypothesis to ethical injunctions.[4] In spite of the atomic size of the jīva, through its attribute of knowledge which expands and contracts, it is able to feel pleasure and pain all over the body, even as the flame of the lamp, though tiny in itself, illumines many things by means of its light, which is capable of contraction and expansion.[5] It can apprehend objects far away in space and remote in time. The cognition of the souls, as in the case of God, is eternal in character, self-sustained, extends over all things, and is valid; albeit its range is narrowed on account of defects, such as past karma and the like.[6] The plurality of souls is evident from the distribution of pleasures and pains.[7] Until liberation, they are bound to prakṛti, which serves as a vehicle (vāhana) to the jīva, even as a horse does to the rider. The bondage to the body, "this muddy vesture of decay," obstructs the vision of the eternal and prevents the soul from recognising its kinship with God.

The soul remains unchanged in its essential nature through all the processes of birth and death. It is born many times into the sensible world and departs from it again; but throughout it maintains its identity. At each pralaya, or destruction of the world, the particular forms of the souls are destroyed, though the souls themselves are indestructible. They cannot

[1] ii. 4. 10.

[2] It is called buddhi, ahaṁkāra and citta according to these three functions.

[3] iii. 2. 9.

[4] iii. 2. 7.

[5] ii. 3. 24–26.

[6] Īśvarasyeva jīvānām api nityaṁ jñānaṁ svataś ca sarvaviṣayam pramātmakam ca, tattatkarmādidoṣavaśāt saṁkucitaviṣayam (Vedānta Deśika: *Seśvara Mīmāṁsā*).

[7] ii. 1. 15.

escape the consequences of their past lives, and they are again thrust into the world at the new creation with appropriate endowments. Association with or dissociation from bodies, resulting in the contraction or expansion of intelligence, is what is meant by birth or death, and, until release, the souls are attached of necessity to bodies, though in pralaya they are connected with subtle stuff which does not admit of differentiation by name and form.[1] The self cannot bear witness to its own past, since memory does not reach beyond the present embodiment.

The characteristic essence of the jīva is the consciousness of self (ahaṁbuddhi). It is not a mere attribute of the self, which might perish, leaving the essential nature of the self unaffected. Self-distinction constitutes the very being of the self. Were it not so, there would be no point in striving for liberation. In the states of bondage and release the soul retains its character of a knowing subject (jñātā). The self is also an active agent. It is because acts belong to the soul that it suffers the consequences of its acts. Simply because it has the power to act it does not, however, follow that it always acts. So long as the souls are attached to bodies due to karma, their acts are largely determined; but when freed from the bodies, they realise their wishes by their mere will (saṁkalpād eva).

The jīva is not one with God, since it differs in essential character from him. It is said to be a part (aṁśa) of Brahman. Though it cannot be a part cut out of the whole, since Brahman admits of no divisions,[2] yet it is comprised within the universal self. Rāmānuja says that the souls are parts in the sense of viśeṣaṇas, qualified forms or modes of Brahman.[3] The souls are regarded as the effects of Brahman, since they cannot

[1] iii. 2. 5.
[2] ii. 3. 42.
[3] " The individual soul is a part (aṁśa) of the highest self, as the light issuing from a luminous thing, such as fire or the sun, is a part of that body, or as the generic characteristics of a cow or a horse, and the white or black colour of things so coloured, are attributes and hence parts of the things in which those attributes inhere, or as the body is part of an embodied being. For by a part is meant that which constitutes one place (ekadeśa) of something; a distinguishing attribute (viśeṣaṇa) is a part of the thing distinguished by that attribute (viśiṣṭavastu). Though the attribute and the substance stand to each other in the relation of part and whole, yet we observe them to differ in essential character " (ii. 3. 45).

exist apart from him, and yet they are not produced effects, as ether and the like. The essential nature of the soul does not alter. The change of state it undergoes relates to the contraction and expansion of intelligence, while the changes on which the production, *e.g.*, of ether depend are changes of essential nature.[1] Characteristics of the soul, such as liability to pain, do not belong to God. He alone is free from the changes of essential nature, characteristic of non-conscious objects, and of contraction and expansion, characteristic of the souls.

The indwelling of the supreme spirit does not deprive the jīva of its autonomy of will, though the mere effort of the individual soul is not enough for action. The co-operation of the supreme spirit is also necessary.[2] Though emphasising the autonomy of the individual soul in determining its future, and though admitting that a good man can transcend the merely natural laws of the universe, Rāmānuja declares that God alone is the supreme moral personality, free from all bondage to matter and karma.[3] God is called the śeṣi, or the sovereign lord, between whom and the individual souls exists the relation of lord and liege expressed by the phrase śeṣa-śeṣibhāva. Śeṣitva is the absolute power of God to deal with the soul.[4]

The questions of human freedom and divine sovereignty assume great importance in Rāmānuja's philosophy, since he is anxious to emphasise both. Individual souls depend entirely on God for their activity. God declares what is good and what is bad, supplies souls with bodies, gives them power to employ them, and is also the cause in an ultimate sense of the freedom and bondage of the souls. Yet, if the world has in it so much suffering and misery, it is not God that is responsible for it, but man, who has the power to work for good or evil. The will of man seems to constitute a limitation of the absoluteness of God. The souls, which have freedom of choice, may act so as to interfere with the

[1] Svarūpānyathābhāvalakṣaṇa, ii. 3. 18.

[2] ii. 3. 41.

[3] i. 1. 21.

[4] Cp. with this Lotze's theory that the soul is aware of its own unity and is a real individual distinct from God and from every other soul, though the soul derives its character from the creative and sustaining nature of God.

will of God. If the absolute God is obliged to take note of and act according to the law of karma, he is not absolute. Rāmānuja escapes from this difficulty by urging that God is ultimately the cause of the actions of all men. But this is not Calvinism, for God acts according to certain laws which are the expression of his nature. God does not make the soul do good or evil acts according to his caprice, but shows his constancy of nature by acting according to the law of karma. If the law of karma is independent of God, then God's absoluteness is compromised. The critic who declares that we cannot save the independence of God without sacrificing the doctrine of karma has not the right conception of the Hindu idea of God. The law of karma expresses the will of God. The order of karma is set up by God, who is the ruler of karma (karmādhyakṣaḥ). Since the law is dependent on God's nature, God himself may be regarded as rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked.[1] To show that the law of karma is not independent of God, it is sometimes said that, though God can suspend the law of karma, still he does not will to do so.[2] Pledged to execute the moral law which is the eternal expression of his righteous will, he permits evil

[1] ii. 2. 3; iii. 2. 4.

[2] Lokācārya says: "Though, on account of his power to do as he likes, God can liberate at one and the same time all the souls by circumventing, *i.e.* removing, the karma of the soul, which depends on him for its essence, permanence, and the like, his decision that he will subject the souls to the restrictions of the scriptures, *i.e.* the law of karma, is due to his mere wish for the joy of the play." Yatthecchaṁ kartuṁ śaktatvāt sakalātmano 'pi yugapad eva muktān kartuṁ samarthatve 'pi svādhīnasvarūpasthityādinātmanaḥ karma vyājīkṛtya dūrīkṛtya śāstramaryādayā tān aṅgīkuryām ittham sthiti līlārasecchayaiva (*Tattvatraya*, p. 108). God is the first cause, while karma is the secondary one. "The divine being . . . having engaged in sport befitting his might and greatness (svamahātmyānuguṇalīlāpravṛttaḥ), and having settled that work (karma), is of a twofold nature (dvaividhyam), good and evil, and having bestowed on all individual souls bodies and sense-organs enabling them to enter on such work and the power to control their bodies and organs (tanniyamanaśakti), and having himself entered into their souls as their inner self, abides within them. . . . The souls endowed with all the powers imparted to them by the Lord . . . apply themselves on their own part and in accordance with their own wishes to work out good or evil (svayam eva svecchānuguṇyena puṇyāpuṇyarūpe karmaṇī upādadate). The Lord then recognising him who performs good acts as one who conforms to his commands, blesses him with piety and wealth, happiness and release, while he makes him who transgresses his commands experience the opposites of all these" (ii. 2. 3).

which he might otherwise arrest. The inner ruler has regard in all cases to the volitional effort which prompts a man's action.[1] He does not care to upset his own laws and interfere with the world-scheme. God, though immanent in the world, does not wish to be intrusive.

There are three classes of jīvas: eternal (nitya), or those who dwell in Vaikuṇṭha, enjoying bliss and free from karma and prakṛti; the freed (mukta), or those who achieve liberation through their wisdom, virtue and devotion; the bound (baddha), or those who wander in saṁsāra owing to their ignorance and selfishness.[2] While the soul can rise to the highest, it can also sink to the lowest, becoming more and more immersed in the body till the life of intelligence is lost, as it were, in the obscure animal movements of sensation and appetite.[3] The souls wandering in saṁsāra are distinguished into four classes: celestial or superhuman, human, animal, and stationary (sthāvara). While all souls are of one kind, their distinctions are due to the bodies with which they are associated. Even caste differences among the souls are due to their connection with different kinds of bodies. In themselves, the souls are neither human nor heavenly, neither Brahmin nor Śūdra. The souls in saṁsāra are grouped into those desirous of enjoyment and those desirous of deliverance. Until the soul attains release it has to be reborn to experience the fruits of karma. The soul, when moving towards another embodiment, is enveloped by the rudiments of the elements[4] which serve as the substrate of life.[5] The subtle body persists so long as the state of bondage lasts.[6] The released go by the devayāna, the good go by pitṛyāna, while the wicked return to earth immediately, without passing to the moon. There are agents of God who lead the soul on its upward way.[7] If souls are in any way sharers in the divine nature, they must have once possessed its freedom and purity. How did they lose these and transfer themselves to the rule of karma? Rāmānuja holds that neither reason nor scripture

[1] ii. 8. 41.

[2] See *Rahasyatrayasāra*, iv. There are some Viśiṣṭādvaitins who believe in those who are for ever bound to the wheel of saṁsāra (nityabaddhaḥ). See *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, ii. 27–28.

[3] i. 1. 4. [4] iii. 1. 1. [5] iii. 1. 3.

[6] iv. 2. 9, and iii. 3. 30. [7] iv. 3. 4.

can tell us how karma got the souls into its power, because the cosmic process is beginningless (anādi).

XIII

MATTER

Prakṛti or matter, kāla or time, and śuddhatattva or pure matter, are the three non-conscious substances. They are objects of experience (bhogya), liable to changes and indifferent to the ends of man.[1] The existence of prakṛti is not an object of perception or of inference. It is accepted on the authority of the scripture.[2] Its three qualities of sattva, rajas and tamas are evolved in it at the time of the world-creation. In pralaya matter exists in an extremely subtle condition, without distinction of name and form, and is called tamas. Matter is uncreated (aja), though its forms appear and disappear.

At creation, from the tamas mahat appears ; from ________ or bhūtādi. From sāttvika ahaṁkāra arise the eleven senses, from the tāmasa, the five tanmātras, or five elements, and rājasāhaṁkāra helps both these processes.[3] From ahaṁkāra comes the subtle element of sound and then ākāśa ; from ākāśa comes the subtle element of touch, and then air and so on for the other elements also. From the qualities of sound, touch, etc., we infer corresponding substances. Sound is in all the elements. The feeling of touch is of three kinds, hot, cold and neutral. There are five colours, which are subject to changes under the action of heat. The Viśiṣṭādvaitins do not admit any real space independent of ākāśa, and argue that we fix certain points in it as east where the sun rises and west where it sets, and measure proximity and distance from these standpoints.[4] Prāṇa or vital breath, is not to be confused with the senses, but is only a peculiar condition (avasthāviśeṣa) of air.[5] Unlike the Sāṁkhya, the Viśiṣṭādvaita holds that the development of prakṛti is caused and controlled by Īśvara.[6]

Kāla or time is given an independent place. It is the form of all existence.[7] It is an object of perception. Dis-

[1] S.D.S., iv.
[2] *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, i. 11.
[3] *Sarvārthasiddhi*, i. 11.
[4] *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, i. 48.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 53–54.
[6] *Sarvārthasiddhi*, i. 16.
[7] According to *Tattvatraya*, kāla is tattvaśūnyam.

tinctions of days, months, etc., are based on the relations of time.[1]

While prakṛti has the three guṇas of sattva, rajas and tamas, śuddhatattva has only sattva. It is the stuff of the body of God in his condition of nityavibhūti. It does not conceal the nature within. God reveals himself as a cosmic his *līlāvibhūti* with the aid of prakṛti, and in his transcendent existence through his *nityavibhūti* with the aid of śuddhatattva.

All these non-conscious entities work in obedience to the will of God.[2] They are not in themselves good or bad, but happen to please or pain the individuals according to their karma. It is God that determines their behaviour, for "if the effects of things depended on their own nature alone, everything would at all times be productive for all persons either of pleasure or of pain only. But this is not observed to be the case." "To the highest Brahman, which is subject to itself only, the same connection is the source of playful sport, consisting in this, that he guides and controls those things in various ways."[3] The world will appear to be essentially blissful to one who has freed himself from all bonds of karma and avidyā. While both souls and matter constitute the body or the attributes of God, he is directly connected with the souls and only indirectly with matter, which is controlled by the souls. Matter is more completely dependent on Brahman than the souls, which have freedom of choice. The latter can partake in the divine life, and thus be lifted above change and death.

XIV

CREATION

According to Rāmānuja, every effect involves a material cause, and the effect of the world implies free existing souls and unevolved matter. Though souls and matter are the modes (prakāras) of God, they have enjoyed the kind of individual

[1] Upādhibhedaḥ (*Tattvamuktākalāpa*, i. 69).
[2] ii. 2. 2.
[3] iii. 2. 12.

existence which is theirs from all eternity, and cannot be entirely resolved into Brahman. They have a sort of secondary subsistence, which is enough to enable them to develop on their own lines. They exist in two different conditions which periodically alternate, the first being a subtle state when they do not possess the qualities by which they are ordinarily known, when there is no distinction of individual name and form, when matter is unevolved (avyakta) and intelligence is contracted (saṁkucita). It is the state of pralaya when Brahman is said to be in a causal condition (kāraṇāvasthā). When creation takes place on account of the will of the Lord, subtle matter becomes gross and souls enter into connection with material bodies corresponding to the degree of merit or demerit acquired by them in previous forms of existence, and their intelligence undergoes a certain amount of expansion (vikāsa). Brahman, with souls and matter thus manifested, is said to be in the effect condition (kāryāvasthā). Creation and destruction are only relative and signify different states of the same causal substance, namely Brahman.[1] Souls and matter have a twofold existence, a causal existence and an effect existence. In their causal existence the souls are unmaterialised and nature is in equipoise; but when the time for creation comes, the souls, under the influence of their karma, disturb the equilibrium of the three guṇas, and prakṛti works out the fruits of their karma under divine providence. It is to enable the souls to undergo the experiences for which their deeds have entitled them that creation is brought about. God creates the world to suit the karma of the souls. In this sense God's creative act is not independent or absolute.[2]

According to the Pañcarātra account, a distinction is made between pure creation (śuddhasṛṣṭi) and gross creation. The former is not so much a creation as the everlasting expression of the inwardness of God's being, wherein the qualities of God, omniscience (jñāna), lordship centred in unimpeded activity (aiśvarya), power to originate the cosmos (śakti), strength to support all (bala), changelessness (vīrya) and the divine self-sufficiency and splendour (tejas) manifest themselves. These qualities form the body of Vāsudeva and Lakṣmī, or of Vāsudeva associated with Lakṣmī. The Vyūhas and the Vibhavas also belong to the pure creation. Vaikuṇṭha, which has for its

[1] See R.B.G., xiii. 2; ix. 7.

[2] ii. 1. 34–35.

cause śuddhasattva belongs to the pure creation.[1] The gross creation takes place in the order already mentioned by means of prakṛti, composed of the three guṇas.[2] For God, the creation of the world is said to be mere līlā or sport.[3] The metaphor of līlā brings out the disinterestedness, freedom and joy underlying the act of creation. It enables Rāmānuja to insist on the absolute freedom and independence of God. Nature and souls are instruments of God's play, and cannot at any time offer any resistance to his will. The whole drama is undertaken by the Lord at his own sweet will.[4]

Saṁkara's difficulty, that from Brahman, which is absolute perfection, the world of imperfection cannot be said to take its rise, at any rate that it is impossible for the finite mind to account for the rise of the finite from out of the infinite, does not trouble Rāmānuja, since he is willing to accept on the authority of the śruti that the finite springs from the infinite. What the śruti says must be capable of being logically determined. Does it or does it not depend on the will of God that there be unevolved matter and immaterial souls? It is quite true that these given elements, on which the divine will is dependent in creation, are not given from outside, as Madhva believes, but inhere in God as his modes. At any rate, the will of God is dependent on their pre-existence. It is theoretically possible to imagine that with a different kind of material the world could have been shaped better. God could not choose the best of all possible worlds, but was obliged to make the best of the given one. Brahman has absolutely non-conditioned existence,[5] which is not the case with non-intelligent matter, which is the abode of change and the souls implicated in matter. But it is difficult to conceive how Brahman could be supposed to be unchangeable in view of the changing conditions of his attributes, souls and matter.

[1] The Bengal School of Vaiṣṇavism accepts this scheme, but substitutes for Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī, Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā.

[2] The Pañcarātra Saṁhitās admit an intermediate creation also.

[3] Cp. Krīḍā harer idam sarvam; again, hare viharasi krīḍā kantukair-iva jantubhih; and also the Sūtra, lokavat tu līlā kaivalyam.

[4] Svasaṁkalpakṛtam (R.B.G., I. 25). Cp.

"God tastes an infinite joy
In infinite ways." (Browning: *Paracelsus*.)

[5] Nirupādhikasattā, i. I. 2. Cp. *Śrutaprakāśikā*: Kenāpi pariṇāma-viśeṣeṇa tattadavasthasya sattā sopādhikasattā, ato nirupādhikasattā nirvikāratvam.

These modes (prakāras) change from a subtle to a gross condition and *vice versa*, and Rāmānuja is obliged to concede that Īśvara is also subject to change.[1] Rāmānuja makes the finite the attribute of the infinite. From this view it should follow that the infinite cannot exist without its attribute, and so the attribute is necessary to the infinite. Yet Rāmānuja is unable to concede it in view of the many opposed scriptural texts. Commenting on the passage, "These beings are not in me,"[2] Rāmānuja says: "By my will I am the supporter of all beings, and yet there is no help to me from any of these beings." "No kind of help whatever is contributed by these towards my existence."[3] The existence of the world is completely immaterial to the divine being. Such a view is hardly consistent with Rāmānuja's general position, that the world has its basis in the nature of God. Commenting on the passage of the *Gītā* that "I enjoy whatever is offered with devotion, be it a leaf or a flower," Rāmānuja observes: "Even though I remain in the enjoyment of my own natural, unbounded and inestimable bliss, I enjoy these as if I obtained a beloved object which lies far beyond the path of my desire."[4] God is ready to acquire some happiness through the willing devotion of his devotees, though he is not equally ready to be touched by the pain and the suffering of others. If the souls are parts of the Lord, then the latter must be afflicted by the pain caused to the soul in its experiences, even as the individual suffers from the pain affecting his hand or foot. So the supreme Lord would suffer more pain than the soul.[5] But Rāmānuja contends that the suffering of the souls does not pollute the nature of God. If the acts of creation, maintenance and destruction give God delight, are we to think that God's delight is capable of modifications, and is increased by these operations? God's nature as transcendent spirit is one of delight, and the modifications of his attributes also add to his joy. As the relation between soul and body is not logically determined, the relation between the transcendent delight which is perfect and incapable of

[1] Ubhayaprakāraviśiṣṭe niyantraṁśe tadavasthatadubhayaviśiṣṭatārūpavikāro bhavati (R.B., ii. 3. 18).
[2] B.G., ix. 4.
[3] Matsthitau tair na kaścid upakāraḥ (R.B.G., ix. 4).
[4] R.B.G., ix. 26.
[5] S.B., ii. 3. 45.

variation and that derived from the changes of his body is not intelligibly stated.

Rāmānuja protests vigorously against the doctrine of māyā and the phenomenality of the world. If the distinctions of the world are due to the imperfections of man's mind, then, for God, there should be no such distinctions; but scripture tells us that God creates the world, allots to different souls their rewards, thus indicating that God reckons with the world of distinction. It cannot be said that the multiplicity is unreal, even as a mirage is; for the latter is unreal because our activity prompted by it is unsuccessful; but not so the activity based on the perception of the world. Nor is it logical to urge that the reality of the world, testified by perception, is sublated by the testimony of the scripture; for the spheres of perception and scripture are quite different, and so they cannot contradict each other.[1] All knowledge reveals objects.[2] To say that objects do not exist, simply because they do not persist, is rather strange. The argument involves a confusion between opposites and distincts. Distinction is not denial. Where two cognitions are mutually contradictory, then both cannot be real. "But jars, pieces of cloth and the like do not contradict one another, since they are separate in place and time. If the non-existence of a thing is cognised at the same time and the same place where and when its existence is cognised, we have a mutual contradiction of two cognitions. But when of a thing that is perceived in connection with some place and time, the non-existence is perceived in connection with some other place and time, there arises no contradiction."[3] In the example of mistaking the rope for a snake, the cognition of non-existence arises in connection with the given place and time. So there is contradiction. But if an object perceived now does not exist at another time and place, we cannot rush to the conclusion that the thing is unreal. Both Śaṁkara

[1] Ākāśavāyvādibhūta . . . padārthagrāhi pratyakṣaṁ; śāstraṁ tu pratyakṣādyaparicchedya sarvāntarātmatvasatyatvādyanantaviśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭa brahmasvarūpa . . . viṣayam, iti śāstrapratyakṣayor na virodhaḥ (*Vedārtha-saṁgraha*, p. 87).

[2] Arthaprakāśa.

[3] Deśāntarakālāntarasaṁbandhitayānubhūtasyānyadeśakālayor abhavā-pratipattau na virodhaḥ (i. 1. 1).

and Rāmānuja lay stress on the logic of identity[1]; only Rāmānuja believes that a true identity implies distinction and determination, though not contradiction and denial.

Rāmānuja urges several objections against the Advaita doctrine of avidyā. What is the seat (āśraya) of avidyā? It cannot be Brahman, who is full of perfections. It cannot be the individual, who is the product of avidyā. Avidyā cannot conceal Brahman, whose nature is self-luminosity. If self-luminous consciousness, which is without object and without substrate, becomes through the influence of an imperfection residing within itself conscious of itself as connected with numberless objects, is that imperfection real or unreal? It is not real, according to Advaita; it cannot be unreal, according to Rāmānuja, since it is something permitted by God himself. In human knowledge, where something unmanifested becomes manifested, we may assume the existence of some entity which hindered the manifestation. But there is no need to attribute to Brahman any such defect. Again, if avidyā involves Brahman also in its meshes, then universal falsehood will alone be the reality, and we cannot escape from it. The nature (svarūpa) of avidyā cannot be logically determined. It is neither real nor unreal. To say that a thing is indefinable (anirvacanīya) is illogical. No means of knowledge (pramāṇa) testifies to the existence of avidyā. Neither perception nor inference nor revelation establishes it. In the scriptures māyā is used to indicate the wonderful power possessed by God, who has nothing to do with an eternal unreal avidyā. On the Advaita view, even the scriptures are a part of the world-error, and the whole foundation of knowledge is destroyed. If cessation (nivartana) of avidyā takes place by means of the knowledge of Brahman devoid of attributes and qualities, then it cannot take place, since such knowledge is impossible. The abolition (nivṛtti) of avidyā, which is a concrete reality, cannot be brought about by abstract knowledge. The world, forsooth, is too great and meaningful to be lightly dismissed as a mere product of avidyā. The real avidyā to which we are the victims is that power of illusion which makes us believe that we ourselves and the world are independent of Brahman.

[1] S.B., ii. 2. 33; R.B., ii. 2. 31.

XV

Ethical and Religious Life

The jīvas in saṁsāra, with their souls shrouded in bodies, are like islanders who live unconscious of the sea. They believe that they are not so much modes of God as products of nature. On account of its past deeds, the soul finds itself confined in a material body, its inner light obscured by the outer darkness. It mistakes the garment of nature for its true self, attributes to itself the qualities of the body, loves the fleeting pleasures of human existence as true bliss, and turns its face away from God. The downfall of the soul is due to karma and avidyā, which bring about its embodiment. The connection of soul, which is pure spirit, with matter is the degradation of the soul. Its sin is not merely a check to its own upward progress, but is also an offence against God. Avidyā has to be displaced by vidyā, or the intuition that God is the fundamental self of all.

Rāmānuja grants to the individual souls freedom to act according to their own will. So far as responsibility is concerned, each individual is an other to God, a different person. When the soul fails to recognise its dependence on God, God helps it to realise the truth by the machinery of karma, which inflicts punishments on the soul, thus reminding it of its sinful efforts. Through the operation of the indwelling God, the soul recognises its sinfulness and entreats God for help. In Rāmānuja's philosophy great emphasis is placed on the conviction of sin and man's responsibility for it. Yāmunācārya describes himself as " the vessel of a thousand sins " and implores the grace of God. The Vaiṣṇava faith does not encourage tapas or austerities.

As a theist, Rāmānuja believes that salvation is possible, not through jñāna and karma, but through bhakti and prasāda (grace). Jñāna, in the scriptures, stands for dhyāna, or meditation, and nididhyāsana or concentrated contemplation.[1] Bhakti is gained through concentration on the truth that

[1] iii. 4. 26.

God is our innermost self and that we are but modes of his substance. But such jñāna cannot be had unless the bad karma is destroyed. Work undertaken in a disinterested spirit helps to remove the past accumulations. So long as karma enjoined in the scriptures is undertaken with a selfish motive, the end cannot be gained. The results of ceremonial observances are transitory, while the result of the knowledge of God is indestructible (akṣaya); but if we perform work in the spirit of dedication to God it helps us in our effort after salvation.[1] Work performed in such a spirit develops the sattva nature and helps the soul to see the truth of things. The two, jñāna and karma, are means to bhakti, or the power which tears up our selfishness by the roots, gives new strength to the will, new eyes to the understanding and new peace to the soul.

Bhakti or devotion is a vague term extending from the lowest form of worship to the highest life of realisation. It has had a continuous history in India from the time of the Ṛg-Veda [2] to the present day. Bhakti, in Rāmānuja, is man's reaching out towards a fuller knowledge of God quietly and meditatively. He insists on an elaborate preparation for bhakti, which includes viveka, or discrimination of food [3]; vimoka, or freedom from all else and longing for God; abhyāsa, or continuous thinking of God; kriyā, or doing good to others [4]; kalyāṇa, or wishing well to all; satyam, or truthfulness; ārjavam, or integrity; dayā, or compassion; ahiṁsā, or non-violence; dāna, or charity; and anavasāda, or cheerfulness and hope.[5] Thus bhakti is not mere emotionalism,[6] but includes the

[1] Tadarpitākhilācāratā (Nārada: *Bhakti Sūtra*, p. 19).

[2] Cp. "All my thoughts, seeking happiness, extol Indra, longing for him; they embrace him as wives embrace a fair young bridegroom, him the divine giver of gifts, that he may help me. My mind is directed to thee, Indra, and does not turn from thee; on thee I rest my desire, O much invoked one" (R.V., x. 43. 1.)

[3] Śaṁkara's interpretation that we should not be attached to the things of sense is better.

[4] Five kinds are distinguished, which are study, worship of God, duties to forefathers, human society and animal creation.

[5] S.D.S., iv.

[6] Svapneśvara, commenting on the word "anurakti" used by Śāṇḍilya, says that anu means after, and rakti attachment, and so anurakti is attachment which comes after the knowledge of God. Blind attachment is not bhakti.

training of the will as well as the intellect.[1] It is knowledge of God as well as obedience to his will.[2] Bhakti is loving God with all our mind and with all our heart. It finds its culmination in an intuitive realisation of God.[3]

Bhakti and mokṣa are organically related, so that at every stage of bhakti we are perfecting ourselves. Bhakti is salvation in becoming, and is regarded as superior to the other methods, since it is its own reward (phalarūpatvāt).[4] The soul becomes through bhakti more and more vividly conscious of its relation to God, until at last it surrenders itself to God, who is the soul of its soul. Then there is no longer self-love or self-seeking, since God has taken the place of self and the whole life is transfigured. Nammāḷvār says: "In return for thy great and good gift—the mingling of my spirit with thine—I have entirely yielded up my spirit to thee."[5] Every drop of one's blood, every beat of one's heart, and every thought of one's brain are surrendered to God. It is a case of "I yet not I." Bhakti is distinguished into formal (vaidhī) and supreme (mukhyā). The formal is the lower phase, where we indulge in prayers, ceremonies and image-worship. All these help the soul onward, but cannot by themselves save the soul. We must worship the supreme; for nothing else, in the last analysis, can serve as the object of meditation.[6]

Prapatti is complete resignation to God,[7] and is, according

[1] Jñānakarmānugṛhītam bhaktiyogam (R.B.G., Introduction). Dhīprītirūpā bhaktiḥ (*Tattvamuktākalāpa*).

[2] In *Vedārthasaṁgraha*, Rāmānuja distinguishes between sādhana-bhakti and parā-bhakti. The former includes control of body, mind and speech, performance of one's duties, study, non-attachment, etc.

[3] i. 1. 1.

[4] Nārada: *Bhakti Sūtra*, p. 26.

[5] *Tiruvāymoḻi*, ii. 3. 4.

[6] Rāmānuja quotes a teacher to the effect: "From Brahmā to a tuft of grass all things that live in the world are subject to saṁsāra due to karma, therefore they cannot be helpful as objects of meditation, since they are all in ignorance and subject to saṁsāra." i. 1. 1.

Ābrahmastambaparyantā jagadantarvyavasthitāḥ
Prāṇinaḥ karmajanitasaṁsāravaśavartinaḥ.
Yatas tato na te dhyāne dhyāninām upakārakāḥ
Avidyāntargatās sarve te hi saṁsāragocarāḥ.

[7] See R.B.G., Introduction to ch. vii and vii. 14. Six factors are distinguished in prapatti, which are: (1) acquisition of qualities which would make one a fit offering to God (ānukūlyasya saṁpattiḥ); (2) avoidance of conduct not acceptable to God (prātikūlyasya varjanam); (3) faith that

to the Bhāgavatas, the most effective means for gaining salvation. It is open to all, the learned as well as the ignorant, the high as well as the low, while the path of bhakti, involving as it does jñāna and karma, is confined to the three upper classes. But anyone, after taking instruction from a preceptor, may fling himself on the bosom of God and take refuge in him. According to the Southern school (Tengalais), which follows more closely the tradition of the Āḷvārs, prapatti is the only way to salvation, and no more effort on the part of the devotee is necessary. God saves the soul who has utterly surrendered himself to him. The Northern school (Vaḍagalais) holds that prapatti is one way of reaching the goal, and not the only way. For them human effort is an essential factor in salvation. The individual who has qualified himself by karma, jñāna, bhakti and prapatti wins the favour of the Lord. This school upholds the markaṭanyāya, or the monkey theory, since the young monkey is to exert and stick to the mother; while the Southern holds the mārjāra-nyāya or the cat theory, since the kitten is taken up by the cat with its mouth. This school holds that nothing depends on man's effort, for the grace of God selects the individuals to be freed. It also believes that the soul is seized by God in one supreme act, which need not be repeated, while the Northern section insists on the continuous offering of the soul to God.

In the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* bhakti is less restrained in its character than in Rāmānuja. A certain tendency to extravagant enthusiasm marks the opening of the religious sense in men. The individual undergoing the conversion of the soul has the shudder of awe and delight. In the *Bhāgavata* bhakti is a surging emotion which thrills the whole frame, chokes speech, and leads to trance. The *Bhāgavata* is indifferent to sacrificial observances and declares that we must love God for his own sake and not for any reward. It admits that union with God is open to any individual, if he cares for it. He can obtain it through bhakti, but the soul who remains

God would protect him (rakṣiṣyatīti viśvāsaḥ); (4) appeal for protection (goptṛtvavaraṇam); (5) a feeling of one's own littleness (kārpaṇyam); and (6) absolute surrender (ātmasamarpaṇam). The last is one with prapatti though the others are means to it.

ever distinct from God he worships is happier than one who becomes absorbed in God.[1] We find in the God of the *Bhāgavata* an intimately human feeling. He is not free (asvatantra), as he is subject to the will of his devotees (bhaktaparādhīna).[2] Without the church of his saints, God does not think much of himself.[3] A striking feature of the *Bhāgavata* is the idealisation of the story of Kṛṣṇa and the gopis. The legend is transformed into the ideal of bhakti and, as we shall see, the later sects of Vaiṣṇavism are influenced by it.

Vaiṣṇava devotion has used the most intimate human relations as symbols of the relation of man and God. God is viewed as the teacher, the friend, the father, the mother, the child, and even as the beloved. The last is stressed by the Āḻvārs, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and the Bengal school of Vaiṣṇavism. In the best love, as in bhakti, to live in the presence of the beloved is the highest happiness and creative productivity; to live without him or her is pain and despair and barrenness. We think that the use of the symbolism of love is wrong because we assume that sensual attraction is all in all in love; but in true love there is little of sensual attraction. Many women, as well as some men, who in love are above the level of beasts, will protest that love is not a mere search after new sensations. In true love, the two souls trust each other more than all others they have met or known before. The lover is ready to fight the world, endure all privations and feel happy in poverty, exile and persecution, for the sake of the beloved. Even if he or she is sundered from the other through many difficulties, so that reunion seems remote, nay impossible, yet he or she cannot afford to lose the other and, at the risk of losing everything else, keeps alive the eternal link created by mutual love which cannot be broken even by death. The stories of Sīta and Sāvitrī, Damayanti and Śakuntalā have burnt this lesson into the heart of India. No wonder the Indian Vaiṣṇava looks upon God as his beloved,[4] and tries to redirect to God the passions, longings and transports of human love. The bhaktas feel helpless and restless when they lose the presence of God, for nothing else can satisfy them. In many of their hymns we find the cry of the heart for God, the sense

[1] *Bhāgavata*, iii. 25. 33. [2] ix. 4. 67.

[3] Nāham ātmānam āśāste madbhaktair sādhubhir vinā (ix. 4. 6). Cp. Bhaktaprāṇo hi kṛṣṇaś ca kṛṣṇaprāṇā hi vaiṣṇavāḥ (*Nāradapañcarātra*, ii. 36).

[4] Cp. Sa eva vāsudevo 'sau sākṣāt puruṣa ucyate
Strīprāyam itarat sarvaṁ jagad brahmapurassaram.

The supreme Lord is the only man; all others, from Brahmā downwards, are women, *i.e.* depend on him and long to be united with him. Cp. also

Svāmitvātmatvaśeṣitvapuṁstvādyas svāmino guṇāḥ
Svebhyo dāsatvadehatvaśeṣatvastrītvadāyinaḥ.

of devastating desolation in his absence, the anticipated joy in his fellowship and a sense, real though undefined, of the preciousness of his love. In the rapt utterances of the Vaiṣṇava saints, we feel the ecstatic joy of the mystic desirous of union with God in a spiritual sense. "Thou splendid light of heaven," cries Nammāḷvār, "thou art in my heart melting and consuming my spirit. When shall I become one with thee?"[1] Deep attachment to God results in an indifference to all else.[2]

The Hindu devotee does not seek to destroy desire, but attempts to lift it from earth to heaven, seeks to withdraw it from creation that he may centre it on the Creator. Maṇavāḷa says: "The pleasure which arises for the ignorant from sense-objects, the same is called bhakti when directed to God; in the case of Nammāḷvār, this bhakti has become love for the beautiful Lord, hence for Āḷvārs there arises the 'love' type of devotion."[3] While many of those who employ the symbolism of bridegroom and bride are free from all traces of eroticism and morally impeccable, it cannot be denied that there were abuses of it.[4] But such abuses were deviations from the normal path.

The distinctions of caste do not touch the nature of the soul. At best they belong to the bodies and determine the duties which the different individuals owe to society. But caste has nothing to do with the qualities of souls. Some of the Āḷvārs worshipped by the Brahmins were Śudras. Rāmānuja allows that no distinctions should be made among the lovers of God.[5] He admits that those outside the āśramas are eligible for the knowledge of Brahman.[6] Strictly speaking, the religion of bhakti or devotion, and prapatti or submission, requires no priest, for the offering of love does not need the

[1] *Tiruvāymoẏi*, v. 10. 1.

[2] Anurāgād virāgaḥ. The way of bhakti has in it four movements: (1) The desire of the soul when it turns towards God and the straining of the emotions towards him; (2) the pain of love unrealised; (3) the delight of love possessed and the play of that delight; and (4) the eternal enjoyment of the divine lover which is the heart of divine bliss.

[3] Yā prītir asti viṣayeṣv avivekabhājām
Saivācyute bhavati bhaktipadābhidheyā.
Bhaktis tu kāma iha tatkamanīyarūpe
Tasmān muner ajani kāmukavākyabhaṅgī.
(*Dramiḍopaniṣadsaṁgati.*)

[4] I.P., pp. 495–496.

[5] Cp. Nāsti teṣu jātividyārūpakuladhanakriyādibhedaḥ (Nārada: *Bhakti Sūtra*, p. 72. Cp. also

Śvapaco 'pi mahīpāla viṣṇubhakto dvijādhikaḥ
Viṣṇubhaktivihīnas tu yatiś ca śvapacādhamaḥ. (*Bhāgavata.*)

[6] iii. 4. 36; i. 3. 32–39.

sanction of the scripture, and the grace of God is not in the keeping of any man. For one who is deep in devotion there is neither scripture nor rule.[1] Rāmānuja preaches equality in worship and proclaims that bhakti transcends all caste distinctions. He admitted the pariahs to the temple at Melkoṭe. But it is by no means clear that he was prepared for a wholesale defiance of the accepted order. Out of deference to tradition he concedes that freedom is open only to the three upper classes, and others will have to work their way up and wait for the next birth. We cannot, therefore, say that he was in full sympathy with the logical implications of his teaching. A later Vaiṣṇava teacher, Rāmānanda (thirteenth century), protested against caste distinctions. "Let no man," he says, "ask a man's caste or sect. Whoever adores God is God's own." His apostolate of about twelve included a Brahmin, a barber, a leather-worker, a Rajput and a woman. Caitanya preached the religion of devotion and love to all men irrespective of caste or class. In South India, on the other hand, Vedānta Deśika emphasised ritualistic religion.[2] Again and again, throughout the history of Indian civilisation, protests were made against the rigidity of caste; but all these protestant movements have not been able to check, in any considerable degree, its sway on the national mind.

XVI

Mokṣa

Salvation, according to Rāmānuja, is not the disappearance of the self, but its release from the limiting barriers. For disappearance of the self will be the destruction of the real self (satyātmanāśa).[3] One substance cannot pass over into another substance.[4] However high a man may rise, there will always be an almighty power, an eternal love for him

[1] Atyantabhaktiyuktānāṁ naiva śāstram na ca kramaḥ.

[2] Śrutismṛtir mamaivājñā yas tām ullaṅghya vartate
Ājñācchedī mama drohī madbhakto 'pi na vaiṣṇavaḥ.

See the chapter on Śāstraniyamanādhikāra in *Rahasyatrayasāra*.

[3] i. 1. 1.

[4] *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, ii. 14. 27.

to reverence, worship and adore. Rāmānuja, who ranks religious experience as the highest open to us, contends that it implies an "other." The released soul attains the nature of God, though not identity with him.[1] It becomes omniscient and is ever having the intuition of God.[2] It desires nothing else, and so has no chance of returning to saṁsāra.[3] It is egoity that is opposed to salvation, and not individuality. The essential nature, though something eternally accomplished, is, in the state of saṁsāra, obscured by avidyā and karma. The state of release means the unimpeded manifestation of the natural qualities of intelligence and bliss. The released soul is said to be svarāṭ in the sense that he is not subject to the law of karma.[4] For Rāmānuja there is no jīvanmukti. One attains to fellowship with God after exhausting all karma and throwing off the physical body. In the state of release the souls are all of the same type. There are no distinctions there of gods, men, animals and plants. In the world of saṁsāra these distinctions have a meaning. It is the connection with matter that gives uniqueness to the soul. But the souls can get rid of this connection, which is not a natural one.[5] It follows that the individuality determined by bodily connections is not eternal. When it is shattered the soul is said to attain the nature of Brahman and manifest its own true nature. It does not develop any new character.[6]

In the released condition the souls have all the perfections of the Supreme except in two points. They are atomic in size, while the supreme spirit is all-pervading. Though of atomic size, the soul can enter into several bodies and experience different worlds created by the Lord[7]; but it has no power over the creative movements of the world, which belong exclusively to Brahman.[8]

[1] Brahmaṇo bhāvaḥ na tu svarūpaikyam (i. 1. 1).

[2] Paripūrṇaparabrahmānubhavam. Cp. "Sarvadeśa sarvakāla sarvāvasthaigaḷilum, sarveśvaranai, anantamgaḷāna, vigraha guṇa vibhūti ceṣṭitamgaḷil oṇrum kurayāmal, niratiśayabhogya māka, visayīkarittukoṇḍirukkum" (*Rahasyatrayasāra*, xxii).

[3] R.B., iv. 4. 22.

[4] *Śrutaprakāśikā*, i. 1. 1.

[5] Karmarūpajñānamūlaḥ, na svarūpakṛtaḥ (i. 1. 1).

[6] iv. 4. 1.

[7] iv. 4. 13–15.

[8] iv. 4. 17.

The city of God consists of a number of souls who do not simply repeat one another. The forms which they assume are due to the pure matter (viśuddhasattva). Through its aid the liberated souls give shape to their thoughts and wishes. At the end of the play—if such a thing can be conceived—each individual soul will have become perfect and yet be regarded as an adjective of the Absolute. The Absolute, which is one self, by virtue of its immanent principle, becomes an interrelated unity of selves without being the less one self. It has a social character about it. Each one of the society of selves aims at no selfish interest, but at the universal being.

The Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy distinguishes two classes of the released: those who are intent on service to God on earth and so do it in heaven, and those (kevalins) who are altogether isolated from the rest, since they achieved their end by constant meditation on the real nature of their own soul.

The picture of the heaven where the redeemed souls dwell is not much different from the usual description.[1] It only differs in details of dress, custom and landscape from the paradise of the popular imagination. There are streams of living waters, trees laden with delicious fruits, gentle breezes and golden sunshine to cheer them. Amid these delights they sing and feast, listen to the music of the heavenly choirs, and enjoy at times philosophic converse with one another. But such a vision of paradise does not satisfy the mystic soul, who cries out against the loneliness of being imprisoned in a particular nature. He yearns to burst through the barriers of personality and merge himself in the life and essence of the universe. In his theory of mokṣa, Rāmānuja does not do justice to the mystics, who thus hunger for becoming one with the supreme reality. For them a heaven painted in terms of earthly experience, however idealised it be, is not essentially different from that experience itself. Though the soul sees God and God only, and is flooded with his presence, she retains her individuality and is still herself and not the object of her vision. A tendency to escape from oneself into God has been the central motive of some seers of the Upaniṣads, the Orphic brotherhood in ancient Greece,

[1] *Nāradapañcarātra*, vi.

and some Christian and Sufi mystics. They try to slough off not only their bodies but their personalities, and melt their souls in God. But there is no evidence that any mystic achieved such a goal. In the nature of things, Rāmānuja contends, evidence of such absorption into God is impossible. He who has become God cannot return to tell us of his experience; he who narrates his story has not become God.

XVII

General Estimate

While the philosophy of Śaṁkara may have some attraction for those superior minds which shy at sentimental solutions of difficulties and seek their internal satisfaction in the discipline of the will, which will enable them to bear with a Stoic calm the worst that circumstances will inflict on them, even Śaṁkara allows that the millions of humanity crave for a God who has some heart about him. Rāmānuja's view is the highest *expression* of the truth, though Śaṁkara would add that the real is something larger and better than our thinking has room for. We need not assume, Rāmānuja contends, that what comes through religion is not the highest reality.[1] Theism of the type advocated by Rāmānuja is what even Śaṁkara allows in life and religion. It is the faith of Hinduism, whether in its Vaiṣṇava, Smārta, Śaiva or Śākta form. It is strange that Western thinkers and critics should overlook this striking fact and persist in foisting on Hinduism as a whole the theory of abstract monism.[2] While Rāmānuja's statement is not in any way inferior to other forms of theism, it is not free from the difficulties incident to the theistic outlook.

By the theory of the relation of viśeṣya and viśeṣaṇa, or

[1] Cp. Bradley: "The man who demands a reality more solid than that of the religious consciousness knows not what he seeks."

[2] Hegel writes: "In the Eastern religions, the first condition is that only the one substance shall, as such, be the true, and that the individual neither can have within himself, nor can he attain to any true value in as far as he maintains himself as against the being in and for itself. He can have true value only through an identification with its substance in which he ceases to exist as subject and disappears into unconsciousness."

substance and attribute, Rāmānuja attempts to bring out the reality of one and one existence only[1] and assimilate the others to it. Taking up the relation of Brahman to the qualities of sat, cit and ānanda, Rāmānuja argues that the unity of these attributes is not an absolute unity but one of inherence, *i.e.* relation, wherein distinction subsists between the substance and the attributes as well as between the attributes themselves. God is the underlying substratum in which infinite attributes inhere. Rāmānuja cannot escape from this conclusion so long as he accepts logical judgment as providing the clue to the nature of ultimate reality. All judgment is a synthesis of subject and predicate or substance and attribute. But all affirmations deal with finite objects, whose unity does not exceed the relation of inherence; in finite experience we do not find the absolute unity. We are impelled to transcend the world of change and finitude in order to reach a reality where the subject and the predicate are absolute. The assumption of such a reality is the basis of all logical procedure. In judgment we try our best to bring out the full nature of reality by a series of predications. But a string of abstractions cannot do justice to the wealth of reality unless we assume that the ultimate reality is thought as such. It is this absolute judgment that is implicit in our mind from the first, that being and thought are one.

Beyond the fact that the Absolute characterised by sat, cit and ānanda is a concrete one possessing these distinctive attributes, Rāmānuja does not tell us how exactly these attributes are found organically related in the Absolute itself.

Between substance and attributes,[2] Brahman and the world, the relation is one of non-difference and not coinherence. For the latter denotes an inherent separateness.

Are the souls and the world also one with Brahman? If so, in what sense? The dependence of the viśeṣaṇas or attributes is eternal and is connected with his essential

[1] *Nyāyasiddhāñjana*, p. 96.

[2] The conception of the relation of substance and attributes is an unsatisfactory one. If the two are identical, the distinction is meaningless; if the two are different, then the relation becomes a purely external one. If the two are related internally by samavāya, this relation itself must be related to the terms, and so on *ad infinitum*.

nature.[1] The world is not merely a viseṣaṇa but has to do with the nature of the supreme as well. It is the manifestation of the inner determination of the real. The admission of individual souls as coeternal with Brahman constitutes a limit. The infinitude of Brahman is compromised by the unconditioned infinitude of its constituent factors. If Brahman and the soul exist coeternally what is the relation between them? An eternal relation between them, whether essential or accidental, will be an inexplicable mystery. The self of Brahman is distinct from its body, and we can call it the unconditioned self.

The finite centres of experience seem to be resolved, in Rāmānuja's scheme, into movements in the life of God. If the Absolute is a perfect personality including all selves and the world, it is difficult to know how the finite selves, with their respective consciousnesses, unique meanings and values, are sustained. One self cannot be a part of another. Rāmānuja's Brahman is not only a supreme self, but an eternal society of eternal selves. How can God both include and exclude the individual in the same ultimate sense? We may distinguish between God as distinct from the lesser spirits who derive their being from him and the Absolute which comprehends all conceivable existence. God, spirits and matter are the Absolute, and not God alone. Yet Rāmānuja identifies God with the Absolute, beside which and beyond which nothing exists. When he emphasises the monistic character of his system, he makes out that the supreme reality has the unity of self-consciousness, and matter and souls are but moments in the being of that supreme spirit. When he is anxious to preserve the independence of the individual, he argues that the individual souls are all centres of consciousness, knowing subjects possessing self-consciousness, though their selfhood is derived from God.

Brahman is the material and the efficient cause of the universe of souls and matter. The changes relate to the body of God, while the soul (dehi) remains unchanged (nirvikāra).[2] "Everything different from that highest self, whether conscious or non-conscious, constitutes its body, while the self

[1] Svarūpānubandhitvena niyatatvāt (ii. 4. 14).

[2] *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, iii. 25.

alone is the unconditioned embodied self."[1] The body of God is the material cause and the soul is the efficient cause, and so we can say that God is both the material and the efficient cause of the world. This distinction is to be maintained; for Rāmānuja believes that the changes of the body do not affect the soul of God, even as the changes of the jīva's body do not affect the essence of the jīva. What, then, is the essence of God which remains unchanged? Whether in a subtle condition, as in pralaya, or a gross condition, as in creation, or an individualised though not imperfect condition, as in the state of release, the essence of Īśvara differs from that of the world. It has also to be distinguished from the nityavibhūti of Īśvara. It is difficult to conceive the nature of the Absolute if we set aside the attributes of sat, cit and ānanda, which, after all, are only attributes. Yet if the attributes form the essential nature of God, then the process of change in them must also affect his nature. Does all this mean that God is not absolute actuality, but is himself in the making ? The distinction, finally, that the soul of God is the efficient cause and his body the material cause is untenable. We cannot take half a fowl for cooking and leave the other to lay eggs.[2]

The crux of all monism is the relation of the finite to the infinite. A system of finite reals cannot itself be infinite We must have something over and above the finite. Rāmānuja comprehends all aspects of the world under the two categories of thought and matter, and finds that the two are well adapted to each other, and so concludes that there is a God who directs the world process. Logic suggests it, religious consciousness confirms it, and so most of us accept it. But it is not a solution of the problem. It is open to say that all explanation is within the reality and not of it. We can never say why the real is what it is. But even within the real the relations are not logically determined. If the finite is equated with thought and matter, such opposed factors cannot belong to the same reality. Either the unity of the whole or the distinction of the attributes requires to be modified. What Rāmānuja does is to combine the two

[1] Svavyatiriktaṁ cetanācetanavastujātaṁ svaśarīram iti, sa eva nirupādhikaś śārīra ātmā (i. 1. 13).

[2] Ānandagiri on B.S., i. 2. 8.

into one Absolute, which is a concrete organic whole, all of whose parts and elements exist in and through a supreme principle which embodies itself in them. The criticism directed against Śaṁkara is that he elevates the Absolute to such a height that there is no path which leads down to the lowlands of humanity. Rāmānuja intends to give us a more satisfying unity which is neither an identity nor an aggregate of parts, but comprehends all differences and relations. One may well ask whether such an absolute experience is not an arbitrary fancy incapable of verification. We can combine words so as to make a plausible statement, but it is doubtful whether there is a corresponding reality. If the Absolute is supposed to be a transcendent changeless existence, it is a problem how such an Absolute, which has no history, includes the time process and the evolution of the world. Unless Rāmānuja is willing to explain away the immutable perfection of the Absolute, and substitute for it a perpetually changing process, a sort of progressing perfection, he cannot give us any satisfactory explanation of the relation of the soul of the Absolute to its body.

How, again, are the mechanism of nature and the sphere of souls combined in the unity? It is all very well to attempt to preserve the unity of the world as well as the distinctness of individuals. But if our sorrows and struggles, sins and imperfections are integral parts of the Absolute, and are eternally present to the divine mind as distinct constituents of his unruffled beatific consciousness, are not the souls simply certain permanent elements in God's mind? On the other hand, if we are separate individuals, God must be separate from us. The mere fact that we share in a common life does not lessen our individuality.[1] Rāmānuja uses the analogy of soul and body to indicate that the body cannot exist apart from the soul embodied in it. When the soul departs the body perishes. Again, body exists only to give pleasure and pain to the soul. The final cause of the body is the soul. But if the analogy is pressed, it will mean that God is all, and the souls and body are merely instrumental

[1] If we assume, says Bradley, that " individual men, yourself and myself, are real, each in his own right, to speak of God as having reality in the religious consciousness is nonsense " (*Truth and Reality*, pp. 434–5).

to the pleasure of God. The concrete universal of certain Hegelian thinkers is a word which does not solve the problem but restates it. The problem of philosophy is for them the relating in one whole of the eternal perfection of the Absolute and the endless process of the world.

Rāmānuja is anxious to conserve the permanent and independent reality of the individual souls, and vigorously protests against the view which reduces individuality to a delusive appearance. Within the one reality, which we may call the Absolute, a distinction is made between God, the individual souls and unconscious matter.[1] The Supreme is the soul of the individual jīva, since all things form the body of God.[2] What Rāmānuja takes for the soul is the empirical ego, which is something finite and has a before and an after. It is not much to the point to urge that all knowledge involves the distinction of subject and object. For this distinction is a relative one. In the case of vision, we distinguish the scene of sight as the object of vision and the eye as the subject. So also in conscious experiencing we distinguish the content of consciousness from its form and call the latter subject and the former object, though, strictly speaking, both these belong to the world of experience. What Rāmānuja calls the subject is not the subject truly conceived as subject, but is a subject which is itself objectified and reduced to one of the many finite objects contained in experience.[3]

Rāmānuja says that the individual soul is not affected by the changes of its body.[4] It is naturally pure. The dark shadows of materiality do but hide its glory, but do not destroy it. Materialisation is but an accident which can be shaken off. This materialisation is the product of sin, but the pure soul cannot sin. So sin cannot be without the

[1] Cp. with this Rashdall's view (*Theory of Good and Evil*, vol. ii, pp. 238 ff.).

[2] Sarvātmatvāt pratyagātmano 'py ātmā paramātmā.

[3] Cp. Gentile: "If then we would know the essence of the mind's transcendental activity, we must not present it as spectator and spectacle, the mind as an object of experience, the subject an outside onlooker. In so far as consciousness is an object of consciousness it is no longer consciousness. Strictly speaking, it is no longer a subject but an object, no longer an ego but a non-ego" (*Theory of Mind as Pure Act*, E.T., p. 6).

[4] Svaśarīragatabālatvayuvatvasthaviratvādayo dharmāḥ jīvaṁ na spṛśanti (i. 1. 13).

embodied soul, and there can be no embodied soul without sin. Rāmānuja, like other Hindu thinkers, gets over the difficulty by the conception of a beginningless saṁsāra. But this involves the pure spirituality of the soul. Sin and punishment both belong to the objective series and have nothing to do with the pure subject, which cannot sin; but if the soul can sin, then it means that it is already connected with matter, and it is not the pure soul but the empirical ego. When it is said that the object series is beginningless, we get the pure spirit on the one side and the object on the other, both being absolute existents, since they find no explanation outside themselves. The soul is pure in itself; the body hangs on to it. How does this happen?

What is the relation of the self to knowledge? Are they different or are they one? If they are different, then experience of pleasure or pain at a certain point in the body will belong to knowledge and not to self, and so the self will not be able to feel pleasure or pain. We cannot say that knowledge is a function (vyāpāra) of the self, for then it must be caused. But, in Rāmānuja, knowledge is eternal and independent, and not a product. If the self and knowledge are one, then even the self will be liable to expansion and contraction. But the atomic soul cannot expand and contract. The relation between the self, which is itself made up of consciousness,[1] and knowledge, is not clearly conceived. The self is filled with consciousness, and has also for its quality consciousness.[2] "Knowledge is distinct from the knowing subject whose quality it is, as smell which is perceived as a quality of earth is distinct from earth."[3] But Rāmānuja admits that in deep sleep there is consciousness, though it does not relate itself to objects.[4] The nature of self is not so much knowledge as pure consciousness, which, now and then, relates itself to objects.

The relation of the jīva to Brahman is not free from difficulties. Rāmānuja says: "The highest Brahman resolved to be many. It thereupon sent forth the entire world, consisting of fire, water, etc., introduced in this world so sent

[1] Vijñānamayo hi jīvo na buddhimātram (i. 1. 13).
[2] ii. 3. 29.
[3] ii. 3. 27.
[4] Jñānasya viṣayagocaratvaṁ jāgaryādāv upalabhyate (ii. 3. 31).

forth, the whole mass of individual souls (cetanam jīvavargam) into different bodies, divine, human, etc., corresponding to the desert of each soul, and finally itself entering according to its wish into these souls, so as to constitute their inner self (jīvāntarātmā), evolved in all these aggregates names and forms, *i.e.* rendered each aggregate something substantial (vastu) and capable of being denoted by a word."[1] The jīva is thus a reflex of the whole reality. Each jīva has (1) the antaryāmin Brahman, the light which lighteth every existence; (2) the soul, which is the knowing subject; and (3) the unconscious instruments through which the soul works. Each individual seems to be a trinity in unity, even as the supreme Brahman is.[2] Brahman is the prototype, of which the individual is the ectype; for each individual possesses in finite and material outlines the supreme perfection of God. Again, when the soul casts off the body and enters on the state of release, it seems to become a bare point of mere existence. It is not cut off from God, since the currents of divine life flow through it. Will there not be an overlapping of these souls? If not, what is it that distinguishes these souls from one another? Are they substances in their own right, or mere qualities housed in the Absolute? Rāmānuja believes that each of these souls has a centrality and has experiences which it organises into a unity, but the logic of it all seems to be rather weak.

Rāmānuja's conception of the individual self reminds us of the Scholastic theory of substance which Kant, in his *Refutation of Rational Psychology*, and Śaṁkara, in his commentary on the *Brahma Sūtra*, have attacked. Rāmānuja believes in a continuous self-identical entity which is eternal, while Śaṁkara maintains that the quality of continuous self-identity is true only of the ātman. On Rāmānuja's view, it is difficult to know the relation between the continuous development and the identical essence of the self. As in Hegel, we have here an identity of process, an identity which is said to persist in and through difference. If the identity of individual self is not affected by the passage from body to body, or by the periodic suspension of consciousness, it

[1] i. 1. 13. [2] Acijjīvaviśiṣṭaparamātmā (i. 1. 13).

follows that the bodily relation, memory and consciousness, are not fundamental to the nature of the self. We cannot understand what the permanent unchanging nature of the self is to which all the known experiences are irrelevant. We seem to be reduced to an abstract monadism where terms like personal identity, continuity of consciousness, immortality and pre-existence are meaningless. The abstract monad has little to do with the concrete living self of experience. It is an assumption to hold that the simple colourless unit called the self is different in each individual. We are obliged to admit that there is a fundamental ātman in each individual, which is somehow related to a fluid historical development.

Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja are the two great thinkers of the Vedānta, and the best qualities of each were the defects of the other. Śaṁkara's apparently arid logic made his system unattractive religiously; Rāmānuja's beautiful stories of the other world, which he narrates with the confidence of one who had personally assisted at the origination of the world, carry no conviction. Śaṁkara's devastating dialectic, which traces all—God, man and the world—to one ultimate consciousness, produces not a little curling of the lips in the followers of Rāmānuja. Śaṁkara's followers outdo the master, and bring his doctrine perilously near atheistic mentalism. The followers of Rāmānuja move with as much Olympian assurance through the chambers of the Divine mind as Milton through the halls of heaven. Yet Rāmānuja had the greatness of a religious genius. Ideas flowed in on him from various sources —the Upaniṣads and the Āgamas, the Purāṇas and the Prabandham—and he responded to them all with some side of his religious nature. All their different elements are held together in the indefinable unity of religious experience. The philosophic spirit was strong in Rāmānuja, so, too, was his religious need. He tries his best to reconcile the demands of the religious feeling with the claims of logical thinking. If he did not succeed in the attempt to give us a systematic and self-contained philosophy of religion, it should not surprise us. Much more remarkable is the deep earnestness and hard logic with which he conceived the problem and laboured to bridge the yawning gulf between the apparently conflicting claims of religion and philosophy. A thin intellect

with no depth of soul may be blind to the wonders of God's ways, and may have offered us a seemingly simple solution. Not so Rāmānuja, who gives us the best type of monotheism conceivable, inset with touches of immanentism.[1]

REFERENCES.

Rāmānuja's commentary on the Brahma Sūtra: Thibaut's E.T. S.B.E., XLVIII.

Rāmānuja's commentary on the Brahma Sūtra: Rangācārya's E.T.

Rāmānuja's commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā: Govindācārya's E.T.

Yatīndramatadīpikā: Govindācārya's E.T.

S.D.S., Ch. IV.

[1] The Saguṇa Brahman of Śaṁkara and the brahmaloka answer to Rāmānuja's Viṣṇu and vaikuṇṭha. Śaṁkara presses the point that these conceptions, though the highest open to us, are not the highest in themselves. This reservation makes little difference so far as life is concerned.

CHAPTER X

THE ŚAIVA, THE ŚĀKTA, AND THE LATER VAIṢṆAVA THEISM

Śaiva Siddhānta—Literature—Metaphysics, ethics and religion—The Pratyabhijñā system of Kashmir—Śāktaism—The dualism of Madhva —Life and literature—Theory of knowledge—God—Soul—Nature— God and the world—Ethics and religion—General estimate—Nimbārka and Keśava—Vallabha—Caitanya, Jīva Gośvāmi and Baladeva.

I

ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA

FROM the beginning the cult of Vaiṣṇavism had for its chief rival Śaivism,[1] which is even to-day a very popular creed in South India. While it prevailed in South India even before the Christian era, it received a great access of strength from its opposition to Buddhism and Jainism, which it, along with Vaiṣṇavism, overcame about the fifth or the sixth century after Christ. It elaborated a distinctive philosophy called the Śaiva Siddhānta about the eleventh century A.D. Dr. Pope, who gave much thought to this system, regards it as "the most elaborate, influential, and undoubtedly the most intrinsically valuable of all the religions of India."[2] While there are striking similarities between the Siddhānta and the Śaivism of Kashmir, we cannot say that the former owes its general structure or essential doctrines to the latter. The earliest Tamil works, like *Tolkāppiam*, refer to the Arivars or

[1] Mādhava's S.D.S. refers to four schools of Śaivism: Nakulīśa-pāśupata, the Śaiva and the Pratyabhijñā, and the Raseśvara. The last is not of philosophical interest. For the central principles of the first, see I.P., pp. 488–489.

[2] *Tiruvāsagam*, p. lxxiv.

the seers, who chalked out the path to freedom and bliss. These latter were influenced by the Vedic conception of Rudra and the Rudra-Śiva cult of the Brāhmaṇas, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad.*[1] Besides these, the twenty-eight Śaiva Āgamas, especially the parts dealing with jñāna or knowledge, the hymns of the Śaiva saints, and the works of the later theologians, form the chief sources of Southern Śaivism.

II

LITERATURE

Twenty-eight Āgamas are recognised,[2] of which the chief is Kāmika, including the section dealing with knowledge called Mṛgendra Āgama. The Tamil saints Māṇikkavāsagar (seventh century A.D.) and Sundarar refer to them. Śaiva devotional literature [3] belongs to the period from the fifth to the ninth centuries. The Śaiva hymns compiled by Naṁbi Āṇḍār Naṁbi (A.D. 1000) are collectively called Tirumurai. The first part, known as Devāram, contains the hymns of Saṁbandar, Appar and Sundarar; of the others the most important is *Tiruvāsagam* of Māṇikkavāsagar. Sekkirar's *Periapurāṇam* (eleventh century), which describes the lives of the sixty-three Śaiva saints, contains some valuable information. Meykaṇḍer's *Sivajñānabodham* (thirteenth century), regarded as an expansion of twelve verses of the Raurava Āgama, is the standard exposition of the Śaiva Siddhānta views. Arulnandi Śivācārya, the first of the forty-nine disciples of Meykaṇḍer, is the author of the important work *Śivajñānasiddhiyar.* Of Umāpati's works (fourteenth century), *Śivaprakāśam, Tiru-arul-payan* are well known. The Śaiva Siddhānta rested on the twofold tradition of the Vedas and the Āgamas [4] and the systematic reconciliation of the two was undertaken by Nīlakaṇṭha [5] (fourteenth century

[1] See I.P., pp. 88, 488–9, 510 ff.

[2] In the Kailāsanātha temple of Conjeevaram we have the earliest inscriptional record of the twenty-eight Śaiva Āgamas in which the Pallava king Rājasiṁhavarman states his faith, and it is said to belong to the end of the fifth century A.D.

[3] "No cult in the world has produced a richer devotional literature, or one more instinct with brilliance of imagination, fervour of feeling and grace of expression" (Barnett: *The Heart of India*, p. 82).

[4] Tirumūlar, quoted in *Siddhānta Dīpikā*, November 1911, p. 205. Śivajñāna Siddhiyar says: "The only real books are the Vedas and the Śaivāgamas. . . . Of them the Vedas are general and given out for all. The Āgamas are special and revealed for the benefit of the blessed, and they contain the essential truths of the Veda and the Vedānta. Both are said to be given out by God" (i. 46). Cp. Nīlakaṇṭha: vayaṁ tu vedaśivāgabhedam na paśyāmaḥ. *Brahmamīmāṁsā*, p. 156.

[5] See Nīlakaṇṭha, i. 1. 3.

A.D.), who wrote a commentary on the *Brahma Sūtra*, interpreting that work in the light of the Śaiva system. He accepts generally the standpoint of Rāmānuja, and protests against the absolute identity or absolute distinction of God on the one side and the souls and the world on the other.[1] The supreme is Śiva, with his consort Aṁbā, having for his body the conscious and unconscious entities. Appaya Dīkṣita's commentary called *Śivārkamaṇidīpikā* is of great value.

III

Doctrines

The supreme reality is called Śiva, and is regarded as beginningless, uncaused, free from defects, the all-doer and the all-knower, who frees the individual soul from the bonds which fetter them. The formula of saccidānanda is interpreted as implying the eight attributes of self-existence, essential purity, intuitive wisdom, infinite intelligence, freedom from all bonds, infinite grace or love, omnipotence, and infinite bliss. Some proofs of the existence of God are mentioned. The world is undergoing change. Its material cause, prakṛti, is unconscious like clay, and cannot organise itself into the world. The development is not due to the elements, which are devoid of intelligence. Karma is equally unavailing. Kāla, or time, is, according to Meykaṇḍar, changeless, though it appears to the observer as changing.[2] It is a condition of all action, but is not by itself an active agent. But if God is directly the cause, his independence and perfection may perhaps be compromised. It is therefore said that God operates through his śakti as his instrumental cause. The principle of karma works in accordance with the spiritual ends of man. It does not frame the ends or make distinctions between good and evil. These are laid down by an infinite spirit, who also, with the aid of his śakti, sees to it that the souls get their proper rewards. As the jar has the potter for its first cause, the staff and the wheel for its instrumental cause, and clay for its material cause, even so the world has

[1] Many of the central passages are echoes of Rāmānuja's bhāṣya. Cp., *e.g.*, Sūkṣmacidacidviśiṣṭam brahma kāraṇam, sthūlacidacidviśiṣṭaṁ tat 'am bhavati (i. 1. 2). But see Appaya Dīkṣita's *Ānandalaharī*.

[2] *Śivajñānabodham*, i. 4.

Śiva for its first cause, śakti for its instrumental cause, and māyā for its material cause. As sound fills all the notes of a tune, or flavour pervades the fruit, so God, by his śakti, pervades the whole world so fully that he does not appear to be different from it. God is the soul of which the universe of nature and man is the body. He is not identical with them, though he dwells in them and they in him. Non-dualism does not mean oneness (ekatva), but inseparability.

Śiva is everlasting, since he is not limited by time. He is omnipresent. He works through his śakti, which is not unconscious but conscious energy—the very body of God. This body is composed of the five mantras,[1] and subserves the five functions of creation, sustenance and destruction of the universe, obscuration or embodiment (tirodhāna) and liberation of the souls. His knowledge is ever-shining and immediate. According to the Pauṣkara Āgama, Śakti, called Kuṇḍalinī (the coiled), or śuddhamāyā, is that from which Śiva derives his functions and in which his being is grounded. Śakti is the intermediate link between Śiva pure consciousness and matter the unconscious. It is the upādhi, the cause of the differentiation of Śiva's functions.[2] It is the cause of the bondage of all beings from Ananta, who is next only to Śiva, downwards, and also of their release. Śakti, often called Umā, is but the reflex of Śiva, and not an independent existence. The Absolute in itself is called Śiva, and the Absolute in relation to objects is called Śakti. In the *Siddhānta*, Śiva is not only the Absolute of metaphysics, but the God of religion. He is the saviour and guru, and he assumes this form out of his great love for mankind. He is the God of love.[3]

To the Lord (pati) belong the paśu, literally cattle, the infinite host of souls. He is not their creator, since they are eternal. The soul is distinct from the body, which is an unconscious object of experience (bhogya). Its presence is evidenced from the facts of memory and recognition. It is an omnipresent, constant, conscious actor. It is the abode

[1] Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva, Aghora, Tatpuruṣa and Īśāna. Cp. Tait. Araṇ., x. 43-47.

[2] *Pauṣkara Āgama*, ii. 1.

[3] *Sivaprakāśam*, i. 1; Nallasvāmi Piḷḷai: *Śaiva Siddhānta*, p. 277.

of the eternal and omnipresent citśakti.[1] It has consciousness (caitanyam), whose essence lies in the act of seeing (dṛkkriyārūpam). According to *Śivajñānasiddhiyar*, the soul is distinct from the gross body as well as the subtle, though united to them, and it has the functions of desire, thought and action (icchājñānakriyā).[2] It becomes one with the thing in which it dwells for the time being. In the world of saṁsāra it concentrates on worldly things, while in the state of release it centres its consciousness on God. During pralaya, the souls devoid of embodiment rest as powers and energies in the great Śiva. The number of souls cannot be increased or decreased. As more souls get released the embodied ones become reduced in number. Consciousness is perfectly manifested in the liberated, while it is obscured in the unliberated. The individual souls are of three classes, according as they are subject to the three, two or one of the impurities.[3] The earth and the rest are also the effects of God's creation. They are unconscious and serve the purposes of the souls.

The web of bonds (pāśajāla) is distinguished into avidyā, karma and māyā.[4] The first is called āṇavamala, or the taint due to the false notion of finiteness (aṇutva) which the soul has. The self, which is pure consciousness, imagines itself to be finite and confined to the body and of limited knowledge and power. It is ignorant of its nature as consciousness and also mistakes the body for its reality. This is the bondage (paśutva) of the soul (paśu). This avidyā is one in all beings, beginningless, dense, great and multiform. Creation, destruction, etc., take place with reference to the finite world, and so they are regarded as the modifications (pariṇāma) of avidyā.[5] Karma is the cause of the conjunction of the conscious soul with the unconscious body. It is an auxiliary of avidyā. It is called karma because it is produced by the activities of beings. It is as unseen (adṛṣṭa) as it is subtle. It prevails during creation and merges back into

[1] *Mṛgendra Āgama*, vii. 5.

[2] iii. 1.

[3] The highest (vijñānakala) are freed from māyā and karma, and have only the one impurity of āṇavam. The next (pralayakala) are those who are subject to the impurities of āṇavam and karma, which bind them to rebirth; and the last (sakala) include all beings subject to the three impurities.

[4] *Mṛgendra Āgama*, ii. 3–7.

[5] *Ibid.*, vii. 11.

māyā during pralaya. It cannot be destroyed, but must work out its results.[1] Māyā is the material cause of the world, unconscious in nature,[2] the seed of the universe, possessing many powers, omnipresent and imperishable. "As the trunk, the leaf and the fruit latent in the seed grow thereform, so the universe from kala to earth (kṣiti) develops from māyā." [3]

The process of creation receives great attention in the Śaiva system. While Śiva is pure consciousness, matter is pure unconsciousness, and Śakti is said to meditate between the two. She is not the material cause of the world, since she is of the nature of consciousness [caitanya). She is the external sound, the connecting-link between the gross and the subtle, the material and the spiritual, the word and the concept,[4] Śuddhamāyā, the mother of the universe, is Vāk, or Nāda, "the voice of the silence." The Śaiva Siddhānta analyses the universe into thirty-six tattvas as against the twenty-five of the Śāṁkhya. Above the puruṣa, we have the pañcakañcuka, or the fivefold envelope of niyati (order), kāla (time), rāga (interest), vidyā (knowledge), kala (power). Above kala there are māyā, Śuddhavidyā, Īśvara, Sadāśiva, Śakti and Śiva. Śivatattva is a class by itself; Sadāśiva, Īśvara and Śuddhavidyā form the Vidyātattvas, and the other thirty-two from māyā downwards are the Ātmatattvas. These are the different stages of evolution. Māyā first evolves into the subtle principles and then into the gross. Kalā, the first principle evolved from māyā, overcomes the impurities obstructing the manifestation of consciousness, and helps it to manifest itself in accordance with karma; by the next principle of vidyā, the soul derives the experience of pleasure and pain. "That instrument by which the active soul observes the operations of buddhi is vidyā."[5] Māyā is the desire on which all experience depends. Kāla or time regulates experiences as past, present and future. Time is not eternal, for eternity is independence of time. Niyati is the fixed order governing the distinction of bodies, organs and the like, for the different souls. The puruṣas are enveloped by these five. The Śaiva Siddhānta holds that the mūlaprakṛti of the Sāṁkhya is itself a product, and admits five subtle principles beyond it. Of these five, the first three serve to manifest the powers of knowledge, action and feeling, while the other two answer roughly to time and space. Prakṛti is the stuff of which the worlds which the puruṣa is to experience are made. It is the first gross development. From prakṛti evolve the guṇas, from the guṇas the buddhi; the rest of the evolution is on the lines of the Sāṁkhya.

---

[1] viii. 1–5. [2] ix. 2–4. [3] *Pauṣkara Āgama*, iii. 4.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 17. [5] *Ibid.*, v. 9.

Śivatattva is the niṣkala, or undifferentiated basis of all consciousness and action. "When śuddhamāyā, the śakti of Śiva, begins her life of activity, then Śiva becomes the experiencing (bhoga) Śiva; he is Sadāśiva, also called Sadākhya, not really separate from Śiva. When śuddhamāyā is actually active, the experiencing Śiva becomes the ruling (adhikāra) Śiva; he is then Īśvara, not really separate from Sadāśiva."[1] It is Sadāśiva that has the body of the five mantras, and not Śiva. Śuddhavidyā is the cause of true knowledge. Between world periods there are pauses of quiescence, at the end of which evolution sets in. The Lord helps the impurities to manifest themselves, and sustains the whole course of their development for the ultimate good of the souls dependent on his grace.[2] He takes note of the activities of the souls and helps them in their onward pursuit. Respect for the law of karma is not a limitation of God's independence, for the law of karma is the means he employs.[3]

The Śaiva Siddhānta does not support the illusory conception of the world. The beginningless saṁsāra is due to matter and souls which are also eternal. The world has a serious moral purpose, and cannot be dismissed as a mere error or jest. God is for ever engaged in the rescue of souls from the bondage of matter. The unceasing rhythm of the world, with the law of karma regulating it, continues for the one purpose of attracting man to the higher life. "Śiva desires that all should know him," says Meykaṇḍer.[4] It is not merely the ambition of the soul to know God, but it is the desire of the Lord as well.

Sin is the threefold bond from which we have to obtain emancipation. We must get rid of the āṇavam or the avidyā, or the defilement which darkens the light of the soul, neutralise the karma which produces rebirth, and shake off the māyā, which is the basis of all impurities. God helps us in our endeavours. A metaphysical absolute, unaffected by the pleasures and pains of the soul, is of no avail. But Śiva is full of grace and is waiting through successive æons to receive the recognition of the soul and his adoring love. A personal tie binds the soul to God. The grace of God is the road to freedom. It demands childlike trust in Śiva. "To those who draw not nigh he gives no boon; to those who draw nigh he vouchsafes all good; the great God knows no dis-

[1] *Pauṣkara Āgama*, i. 25–26.
[2] vii. 11–22.
[3] S.D.S., vii; *Śivajñānabodham*, ii. 5.
[4] *Śivajñānabodham*, xii. 3.

like." [1] The Śaiva saints yearn to see God. Māṇikkavāsagar sings :—

To cast quite off this sinful frame ; to enter Śiva's home
To see the wondrous Light, that so these eyes may gladness gain ;
O Infinite, without compare ! The assembly of Thy saints
Of old, to see, Behold, O Sire, Thy servant's soul hath yearned.[2]

The consciousness of sin is intensely felt, and some saints utter the cry that their sins are shutting them off from communion with God.[3] The devotion of the Śaivas is more virile and masculine than that of the Vaiṣṇavas.

Tiruvāsagam [4] depicts in beautiful hymns the progress of the soul from the bondage of ignorance and passion into the liberty of light and love, its first awakening, its joy and exaltation, waywardness and despondency, struggle and unrest, the peace and the joy of union. In the intuition of God, the distinction of knower, knowledge and known is said to disappear.[5] There was, at any rate, in the early form of Śaivism, a spirit of toleration. "Whatever God you worship, even as he Śiva will appear. He who is above all this will understand your true worship and show you grace." [6] The guru or the teacher plays an important part in the scheme of salvation. The true guru is one who is in his last birth ; and Śiva himself is said to live in the guru, looking lovingly on the disciple through the eyes of the guru.[7] There are no incarnations of Śiva, though he appears frequently to test

[1] *Tiru-aruḷ-payan*, i. 9. [2] Pope's Trans., *Tiruvāsagam*, xxv. 9.

[3] Cp. Appar :—

"Evil, all evil my race, evil my qualities all,
Great am I only in sin, evil is even my good.
Evil my innermost self, foolish, avoiding the pure,
Beast am I not, yet the ways of the beast I can never forsake.
. . . .
Ah ! wretched man that I am,
Whereunto came I to birth."

(Kingsbury and Philips : *Hymns of the Tamil Śaivite Saints*, p. 47.)

[4] Regarding the literature of the Śaiva Siddhānta, Sir Charles Eliot writes : "In no literature with which I am acquainted has the individual religious life—its struggles and dejections, its hopes and fears, its confidence and its triumph—received a delineation more frank and more profound" (*Hinduism and Buddhism*, vol. ii, p. 217).

[5] *Tiru-aruḷ-payan*, viii. 74. [6] *Śivajñānāsiddhiyar*.

[7] *Tiru-aruḷ-payan*, v.

the bhakti of the devotees or initiate them into truth. But Śiva is not born; nor has he any human career.

The ethical virtues are insisted on. Siddhiyar says: "They have no love for God who have no love for all mankind."[1] Though the law of karma is inviolable, the choice of the soul is not fettered. God is always ready to second the efforts of man. Karma and jñāna conjointly produce release.[2] The restrictions of caste lose their rigour in any true theism. Though Māṇikkavāsagar did not develop a defiant attitude towards the caste rules, the later Śaivas, Paṭṭaṇathu Piḷḷai, Kapilar, and the Telugu poet, Vemana, are critical of the caste restrictions. Tirumūlar held that there was only one caste, even as there was only one God.[3] The reform movement of Basava (middle of the twelfth century) is marked by its revolt against the supremacy of the Brahmin, though Basava himself was a Brahmin.[4] This sect does not accept the hypothesis of rebirth.

After the destruction of pāśa, the individual is said to become Śiva,[5] *i.e.* attain perfect resemblance to him, though the five functions of creation, etc., are reserved for God only.[6] Since the soul has no dust or darkness in it, the light of God shines through it. Deliverance is not becoming one with God, but enjoying the presence of the Lord. Meykaṇḍar says: "Did the soul perish on becoming united with Śiva, there would be no eternal being to be associated with God. If it does not perish, but remains a dissociated being, then there would be no union with God. But the impurities will cease to affect the soul, and then the soul, like the union of salt with water, will become united with Śiva as his servant and exist at his feet as one with him."[7] "On the removal of sin, the soul attains to the status of Śiva himself."[8] The

[1] xii. 2, quoted in *Siddhānta Dīpikā*, November 1912, p. 239.

[2] Nīlakaṇṭha, i. 1. 1.

[3] Onre kulamum oruvane devanum (*Tirumantram*).

[4] Though the Lingāyata reformation started with a vigorous protest against the caste system, the Lingāyats to-day observe caste divisions.

[5] *Mṛgendra Āgama*, vi. 7. "Nirantaraṁ śivo 'ham iti bhāvanā pravāheṇa, śithilitapāśatayā'pagatapaśubhāva upāsakaḥ śiva eva bhavati" (Nīlakaṇṭha on iv. 1. 3).

[6] Nīlakaṇṭha on iv. 4. 7.

[7] *Śivajñānabodham*, xi. 5 See also Pope's Note iii, *Tiruvāsagam*, p. xlii.

[8] Nīlakaṇṭha, iv. 4. 4.

freed souls may exist in an embodied or disembodied condition.[1] Some Śaivas believe that in emancipation the body itself is irradiated with the light of Śiva; others think that the souls acquire some miraculous powers. Before they attain union with the Supreme, the souls must consume the fruits of their deeds. The jīvanmukta, though in the body, is one in feeling and faculty with the Supreme. He does not engage in works which lead to further embodiments. He is filled with the presence of God.[2] He continues to be embodied until his past karma is exhausted, and the deeds of the interval are consumed by the grace of God.[3] All the deeds performed by the freed are due to the impulsion of God within them[4]

IV

The Pratyabhijñā System

Though the Āgamas were also the basis of Kashmir Śaivism, the later works show a distinct leaning to Advaitism.

Vasugupta (eighth century A.D.) is said to have found the *Śiva Sūtra* and taught it to Kallaṭa. *Spanda Kārikā* composed by Vasugupta or Kallaṭa, Somānanda's *Śivadṛṣṭi* (A.D. 900), Utpala's *Pratyabhijñā Sūtra* (A.D. 930), Abhinavagupta's *Paramārthasāra* and *Pratyabhijñāvimarśini*, *Tantrāloka*, Kṣemarāja's *Śivasūtravimarśinī* and *Spandasandoha*, are some of the important works of this school. They accept the Śaiva Āgamas and the Siddhānta works as authoritative, and modify them in the direction of Śaṁkara's Advaita. These works, which show differences of opinion and are said to represent three distinct kinds of monistic idealism, are collectively called Trika.[5] *Śiva Sūtra* with Bhāskara's *Vārttika* and Kṣemarāja's *Vimarśinī* represents one tendency; Vasugupta's *Spanda Kārikā*, with Kallaṭa's *Vṛtti*, expound an idealism which is not much different from the first. Somānanda's *Śivadṛṣṭi* and Utpala's *Pratyabhijñā Sūtra* and Abhinava-

[1] Nīlakaṇṭha, iv. 4. 5.
[2] *Tiru-aruḷ-payan*, x. 93.
[3] *Ibid.*, x. 98.
[4] "The tongue itself that cries to thee,—all other powers
Of my whole being that cry out—all are Thyself!
Thou art my way of strength! The trembling thrill that runs
Through me is Thee! Myself the whole of ill and weal!
None other here! . . ."
(Pope's trans. of *Tiruvāśagam*, xxxiii. 5.)

[5] They are so called since they treat of the ultimates, God, soul and matter.

gupta's works support non-dualism.[1] Of these the last seemed to Mādhava the most important, for he brings the other two under it,[2] and the supporters of the doctrine also held that all other systems were preparatory stages for it.[3]

The only reality of the universe is Śiva, who is infinite consciousness and unrestricted independence. He has many other features like omnipresence, eternality, formlessness, though independence (svacchanda) is peculiar to him. Śiva is the subject as well as the object, the experiencer as well as the experienced.[4] "As the consciousness on which all this resultant world is established, whence it issues, is free in its nature, it cannot be restricted anywhere. As it moves in the differentiated states of waking, sleeping, etc., identifying itself with them, it never falls from its true nature as the knower."[5] In the strain of Advaita Vedānta, it is said, "That in which there is no pleasure, no pain, no known or knower, nor again unconsciousness, alone really exists."[6] The reality of the subject does not require proof, since all proof assumes it.[7] A second to Śiva there is none. The world exists within consciousness, though it seems to be outside. "The Lord, of the form of cit (intelligence), being under the influence of desire, causes the totality of objects to shine, as if existing outside, though without a substratum, like a Yogi."[8] The existence of a prompting cause, like karma, or a material cause, like prakṛti, for the creation of the world is not admitted. Nor is māyā the principle which creates illusory forms. God is absolutely independent, and creates all that exists by the mere force of his will. He makes the world appear in himself as if it were distinct from himself, though not so really; even as objects appear in a mirror. God is as unaffected by the objects of his creation as the mirror is by the images reflected in it. By his own wonderful power (śakti) inherent in him, God appears in the form of

[1] See *Paramārthasāra*, pp. 34 and 36, 48–50, 54.

[2] S.D.S., viii.

[3] Tad bhūmikāḥ sarvadarśanasthitayaḥ (*Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya Sūtra*, p. 8).

[4] *Spandakārikā*, p. 29.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 2–4.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[7] *Śivasūtravimarśini*, p. 5.

[8] *Īśvarapratyabhijñā Sūtra*, v. 6. *Paramārthasāra* says that the Lord, compact of thought and bliss, brings into being Śakti, māyā, prakṛti and the earth (see 4). The Lord assumes the semblance of gods, men, etc. (6).

souls and constitutes objects for their experiences.[1] The only reality is the unlimited pure self, the one and only substratum of the universe, whose activity (spanda, vibration) is the cause of all distinctions.

While Śiva is the changeless reality underlying the entire universe, his energy or śakti has an infinity of aspects, of which the chief are cit (intelligence), ānanda (bliss), icchā (will), jñāna (knowledge), and, kriyā (creative power). Thirty-six tattvas or principles, are recognised. When Śakti functions as cit, the Absolute becomes the pure experience called Śivatattva. So soon as life is introduced by the operation of the ānanda of Śakti, we get the second stage of Śaktitattva. The will to self-expression brings about the third stage of being. There is next the conscious experience (jñāna) of being, the Īśvaratattva with its power and will to create the universe. In the next stage there is the knower, as well as the object of knowledge, when action (kriyā) commences. It is the stage of *Śuddhavidyā*. Thus the five transcendental tattvas are the expression of the Śakti of Śiva with its five powers.

The phenomenal world arises through the force of māyā, from which the limitations of space (niyati), time (kāla), interest (rāga), knowledge (vidyā) and power (kala) arise. Through the force of māyā, the infinite experience manifests itself in a number of limited experiences or puruṣas. But all limitation implies a somewhat which limits. The distinction between puruṣa and prakṛti arises. Further evolution is on the lines of the Sāṁkhya scheme. All the stages of evolution are traced back to the one absolute Śiva. The cyclical appearance and disappearance of the world are admitted. The process of the manifestation (ābhāsa) of the universe does not stain the purity of the absolute Śiva, who transcends his own manifestations.

As the soul is of the nature of consciousness, and the individual soul is the same as the universal soul, the doctrine of an ultimate plurality of souls is denied. The pure consciousness dwells in each of us, though it is obscured by unreal upādhis. Our bondage is due to ignorance (ajñāna).[2] Kṣemarāja observes : " Being infinite consciousness, the soul thinks ' I am finite ' ; being independent, he thinks ' I am the body.' [3] It forgets that the world is wholly unreal apart from Śiva and that the soul is identical with Śiva."

Recognition (pratyabhijñā) of the reality is all that is needed for release. If the individual soul is one with the universal soul, it may be asked, why is the recognition of the fact necessary ? Mādhava answers the question by an analogy. A love-sick woman is not consoled by the mere presence of the lover, she must recognise him to be so. The bondage of ignorance is overcome only by this recognition. When the soul recognises itself as God, it rests in the mystic bliss of

---

[1] *Paramārthasāra*, pp. 48–50.
[2] *Śiva Sūtra*, 2.
[3] Commenting on *Śiva Sūtra*, i. 2.

oneness with God. According to the Spanda school, the soul gains knowledge through intense yogic contemplation, realises the supremacy of Śiva in the universe and becomes absorbed in the mystic trance of peace and quietness. The three methods of gaining release mentioned in the *Śiva Sūtra* belong to the Śaiva, the Tantra and the Yoga.

According to Abhinavagupta, there are three classes of liberated souls: those assimilated to the Supreme (paramukta), those united to him in his manifested phase (aparamukta), and those still in the body (jīvanmukta). The delivered soul becomes one with the Supreme, since it is admitted that "there is nothing distinct from the redeemed to which he should offer praise or oblation."[1] "When thus the imagining of duality has vanished, the individual has surmounted the illusive māyā, he is merged in Brahman as water in water or milk in milk."[2]

ŚĀKTAISM

The cult of Śakti[3] finds its beginnings in the Ṛg-Veda. In one of the hymns Śakti is represented as the embodiment of power, "the supporter of the earth living in heaven."[4] She is the supreme power "by which the universe is upheld,"[5] "the great mother of the devotees (suvratānām)," and soon became identified with "Umā of golden hue" of the *Kena Upaniṣad*. In the *Mahābhārata* she is the sister of Kṛṣṇa, and so became related to Vaiṣṇavism. The Śaivas made her the wife of Śiva. In the Purāṇas she appears as Caṇḍī, with a daily worship and an autumn festival. She soon came to be worshipped as Devī, who is one with Brahman, the absolute, whose nature is sat, cit and ānanda, and might be contemplated as male, female or attributeless.[6] Gradually the worship of Śakti as the world-mother displaced Vedic ritualism. The literature relating to this phase of Hinduism is called Tantra. It is famous for its reverence for women, who are regarded as forms of the divine mother.[7]

[1] J.R.A.S., 1910.
[2] *Paramārthasāra*, p. 51.
[3] I.P., pp. 487–8.
[4] i. 136. 3.
[5] See Chān. Up., iii. 12; Bṛh. Up., v. 14.
[6] Cp. Puṁrūpāṁ vā smared devīṁ strīrūpāṁ vā vicintayet
Athavā niṣkalām dhyāyet saccidānandalakṣaṇām.
[7] Vidyāḥ samastās tava devi bhedāḥ.
Striyaḥ samastāḥ sakalā jagatsu.
Saptaśatī, xi. 5.

The seventy-seven Āgamas belonging to the Śākta cult are divided into five subhāgamas (or samaya), which teach practices leading to knowledge and liberation, sixty-four kaulāgamas which teach practices intended to develop magical powers, and eight miśrāgamas which aim at both.' Bhāskararāya quotes nine sūtras in his *Lalitasahasranāmabhāṣya* from a work called *Śakti Sūtra*. The latter work has not come down to us. The Tantras, which are in the form of dialogues between Śiva and Devī, themselves belong to the seventh century and onwards. Thanks to the loving labours of Sir John Woodroffe, the chief of the available Tantra texts are now published.

Śiva in this system is of the nature of omnipresent (akhilānugata), pure consciousness (prakāśa), impersonal and inactive. It is pure being devoid of any relativity. The active personal being, Śakti, includes all individual souls. The opening verse of *Saundaryalaharī* reads: "Śiva, when he is united with Śakti, is able to create; otherwise he is unable even to move."[1] Śiva and Śakti are related as prakāśa and vimarśa. Bhāskararāya defines vimarśa as the spontaneous vibration of the ultimate reality.[2] The first touch of relation in the pure absolute is Vimarśa, which gives rise to the world of distinctions. Vimarśa or Śakti is the power latent in the absolute or pure consciousness. It is the absolute personified, consciousness become a subject, and it passes over into its opposite, the not-self or the object. If Śiva is consciousness (cit), Śakti is the formative energy of consciousness, Cidrūpiṇī. Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva perform their functions of creation, preservation and destruction in obedience to Śakti.[3] In the perfect experience of ānanda, Śiva and Śakti are indistinguishable. The two coalesce in one being. Śiva answers to the indeterminate Brahman in a state of quiescence; Śakti is determinate Brahman endowed with icchā (will), jñāna (knowledge), and kriyā (action), projecting the whole objective universe. Śiva and Śakti are one, since force is inherent in existence. The force may be at rest or in action, but it exists none the less in both the states. The potentiality of the whole object-world exists as the Śakti of Śiva.

[1] Śivaḥ śaktyā yukto yadi bhavati śaktaḥ prabhavitum
Na ced evaṁ devo na khalu kuśalaḥ spanditum api.

[2] See his commentary on *Lalitasahasranāma* under Vimarśarūpiṇī, p. 548.

[3] *Ānandalaharī*, pp. 2 and 24.

Śakti is differentiated as gross and subtle. She is the mother of all things. The five functions of illumination (ābhāsa), coloration (rakti), examination (vimarśana), sowing the seed (bījāvasthāna) and lamentation (vilāpanatā) are attributed to her. There is also the non-conscious matter which corresponds to the prakṛti of the Sāṁkhya system.

Prakṛti or māyā is looked upon as of the substance of Devī.[1] Within the womb of Śakti is māyā or prakṛti, the matrix of the universe, potential in pralaya and active in creation. The Sāṁkhya account of evolution from prakṛti is followed. Under Śakti's direction, māyā evolves into the several material elements and physical portions of all sentient beings. In all living beings, caitanya or consciousness is present, though it appears as broken up into a multiplicity of beings on account of the varying physical adjuncts. Instead of the twenty-five tattvas of the Sāṁkhya, we have thirty-six, which are classified into: (1) Śivatattva, the supreme; (2) Vidyātattva, or the subtle manifestations of Śakti; (3) Ātmatattva, or the material universe from māyā down to earth. These three answer to prakāśa (Śiva), vimarśa and the not-self. The supreme spirit of the Śākta scheme has inner differences, though frequently we meet with ideas of salvation and oneness of the world, which remind us of Śaṁkara's more rigorous non-dualism.[2] We have, first of all, the absolute Brahman; next, we have the determinate subject endowed with Śakti. Nāda issues immediately and from nāda bindu appears,[3] and then the Śuddhamāyā. These five answer to Śiva, Śakti, Sadākhya, Īśvara and the Śuddhamāyā of the Śaivas. The rest of the evolution is not different from the Śaiva scheme.

The jīva, under the influence of māyā, looks upon itself as an independent agent and enjoyer until release is gained. Knowledge of Śakti is the road to salvation,[4] which is dissolution in the blissful effulgence of the Supreme. It is said that "for him who realises that all things are Brahman, there is neither Yoga nor worship."[5] Jīvanmukti, or liberation in this life, is admitted.[6] Liberation depends on self-culture,

[1] Sāmyāvasthā guṇopādhikā brahmarūpiṇī devī.

[2] It is said to be a non-dualism. *Kulārṇava Tantra*, i. 108. Sir John Woodroffe, who has made a special study of the Tantra school, believes that its philosophy "occupies in some sense a middle place between the dualism of the Sāṁkhya and Śaṁkara's ultra-monistic interpretation of the Vedānta" (*Indian Philosophical Review*, vol. i, p. 122).

[3] *Śāradātilaka*, i.

[4] Śaktijñānaṁ vinā devi nirvāṇaṁ naiva jāyate (*Niruttara Tantra*).

[5] *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra*, xiv. 123. See also 124–127.

[6] *Ibid.*, xiv. 135.

which leads to spiritual insight. It "does not come from the recitation of hymns, sacrifices or a hundred fasts. Man is liberated by the knowledge that he is himself Brahman." [1] "The state of mind in which it is realised that Brahman alone is (brahmasadbhāva), is the highest; that in which there is meditation on Brahman (dhyānabhāva) is the middle; praise (stuti) and recitation (japa) of hymns is the next, and external worship is the lowest of all." [2] There is a protest against ritualistic religion. *Kulārṇava Tantra* says: "If the mere rubbing of the body with mud and ashes gains liberation, then the village dogs who roll in them have attained it." [3] The distinctions of castes are subordinated; and the discipline of the Tantras is open to all.[4] Bhakti is regarded as helpful to salvation. Freedom of worship is allowed. "As all streams flow into the ocean, so the worship offered to any God is received by Brahman." [5] The subordinate deities are however subject to the force of karma and time.[6]

The mystic side of the Yoga system plays a large part throughout. Mantras are sacred and are regarded as divine creations, in a sense, identical with Śakti, who is Śabda, or eternal word. Great emphasis is laid on the awakening of the forces within the organism. The perfected man will awaken the Kuṇḍalinī and pierce the six cakras.[7] The theories of karma, rebirth, gross and subtle bodies, are accepted by the Śākta thinkers.

VI

MADHVA

A leading form of reaction against Śaṁkara's Advaitism is the dualistic philosophy associated with the name of Madhva,

[1] *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra*, xiv. 115, 116. [2] *Ibid.*, xiv. 122.

[3] i.

[4] Antyajā api ye bhaktā nāmajñānādhikāriṇaḥ
Strīśūdrabrahmabandhūnāṁ tantrajñāne 'dhikāritā.
(*Vyomasaṁhitā*).

[5] *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra*, ii. 50.

[6] Ye samastā jagatsṛṣṭisthitisaṁhārakāriṇaḥ
Te' pi kāleṣu līyante kālo hi balavattaraḥ.

[7] See Avalon: *The Serpent Power*. A cloud hangs over the sādhana of the Śāktas. Though much of the obloquy is undeserved, there is apparently something which can be improved.

which has many points in common with Rāmānuja's view of reality.[1] Madhva stands out for unqualified dualism and insists on the five great distinctions of God and the individual, God and matter, the individual soul and matter, one soul and another, and one part of matter and another. The doctrines of exclusive mediatorship through Vāyu, the son of Viṣṇu, eternal hell as well as the missionary fervour of Madhva's faith, suggest the influence of Christianity, though there is little evidence in support of it. In view of the fact that Madhva's commentary on the *Kena Upaniṣad* is taken from *Brahmasāra*, it is reasonable to think that there was the tradition of dualism even prior to Madhva. As we shall see, Madhva makes a clever use of the Sāṁkhya and the N vaiśeṣika theories.

VII

Life and Literature

Madhva,[2] also known as Pūrṇaprajñā and Ānandatīrtha, was born in the year 1199 in a village near Udipi, of the South Canara district. He became early very proficient in Vedic learning and soon became a saññyāsin. He spent several years in prayer and meditation, study and discussion. He developed his dualistic philosophy in discussions with his preceptor Acyutaprekṣa, an adherent of Śaṁkara's school. He proclaimed the supreme godhead of Viṣṇu and admitted the validity of branding one's shoulders with the arms of Viṣṇu, a practice accepted by Rāmānuja. He made many converts to his faith in different parts of the country, founded a temple for Kṛṣṇa at Udipi, and made it the rallying centre for all his followers. Prohibition of bloodshed, in connection with sacrifices, is a salutary reform for which he is responsible. He died at the age of seventy-nine.

The standard treatises of this school of thought are, of course, the works of Madhva. He wrote a commentary on

[1] The main differences are that while Rāmānuja thinks that the individual souls are similar in their natural essence, Madhva makes them different. Madhva denies that Brahman is the material cause, which Rāmānuja admits. For Madhva, the universe is not the body of God. In Rāmānuja there are no souls disqualified for salvation and there are no differences in the enjoyment of bliss for freed souls.

[2] Nārāyaṇācārya's *Madhvavijaya* and *Maṇimañjari* contain the orthodox account of Madhva's life and work. If we eliminate the miracles and supernatural incidents which the piety of his followers attributed to him, we may get the historical basis of Madhva's life and mission.

and justified his interpretation of it in another work called *Anuvyākhyāna*. His commentaries on the *Bhagavadgītā* and the Upaniṣads,[1] his epitome of the *Mahābhārata* called *Bhāratatātparyanirṇaya* and gloss on the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* help to elucidate his philosophy. He also wrote a commentary on the first forty hymns of the Ṛg-Veda and discussed many philosophical and other themes in his *Prakaraṇas*. Throughout his works he gives the impression that he relies more on the Purāṇas than on the Prasthānatraya, the Upaniṣads, the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Brahma Sūtra*. It is not quite easy for Madhva to interpret these authoritative works in the interests of his dualistic metaphysics. Jayatīrtha's commentary on Madhva's *Sūtrabhāṣya* and that on Madhva's *Anuvyākhyāna* called *Nyāyasudhā*, are works of great importance. Vyāsarāya wrote a gloss called *Candrikā* on Jayatīrtha's commentary on Madhva's *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Pūrṇānanda's *Tattvamuktāvali*[2] is a bitter attack on the Advaitavāda.

VIII

Theory of Knowledge

Madhva accepts the three sources of knowledge, perception, inference and scriptural testimony. Comparison (upamāna) is regarded as a variety of inference. Perception and inference by themselves cannot help us to solve the riddle of the universe. Perception is confined to the facts open to the senses. Inference is incapable of supplying us with new facts, though it helps us to test and systematise the facts obtained through other means. We have to depend on the Vedas for a true knowledge of reality. Madhva accepts the authoritativeness of the Vedas as a whole, and does not discriminate between the different parts of it. The Hymns and the Brāhmaṇas are as useful and valid as the Upaniṣads. Madhva distinguishes between testimony due to personal authority (pauruṣeya), which may be fallible, and that which is not the composition of any person (apauruṣeya). The latter is of absolute validity and infallible. The Vedas, of which Madhva's philosophy purports to be the right interpretation, are regarded by Madhva as apauruṣeya or uncreated by any personal author, and are therefore said to be authoritative in character.

[1] See S.B.H., vols. i, iii and xiv.

[2] Translated by Cowell. See J.R.A.S., vol. xv, pt. ii.

Apprehension, through whatever means, is the direct evidence of the thing that is apprehended. The instruments which mediate apprehension are not present in the apprehension itself. The relation between the knower and the known is direct and immediate. The pramāṇas of perception, inference, and Vedic testimony, are so called simply because they are instrumental in producing knowledge—which fact comes out when we study knowledge externally. Every apprehension of fact that we have is valid, and implies the existence of the fact, even though it may exist only for the moment of apprehension. If we repudiate it as invalid, it is because of some other apprehension whose validity we accept. Sunrise and sunset are occurrences, until we have the further knowledge that the sun neither rises nor sets. Madhva accepts the intrinsic validity of apprehension as such, and disputes every theory which regards our knowledge as a mere appearance. If our knowledge does not reveal the structure of reality and indicate objective existence, but simply gives us a wrong lead, then the unreal cannot even appear, cannot be the object of even erroneous apprehension, and cannot be related to knowledge as cause to effect. If all knowledge is erroneous, the distinction between true and false ideas disappears. An analysis of illusion tells us that there is an object presented to consciousness, though we mistake its nature, owing to some defect of the senses or other means of knowledge. The elements of false perception are not false. They are facts of experience. Through some defect, we do not take a full view of the object, but what we see of it recalls something like it in nature, though different from it, with which we confuse the given datum. Every case of illusion implies two positive entities, a given thing and a suggested object. The notion of the unreality of the world means that there is something real which we mistake for something else. It does not mean that there is nothing real at all.

Madhva takes his stand on experience or knowledge and argues that there can be no knowledge without a knower and a known. To speak of knowledge, independent of a knowing subject or a known object, is meaningless. Knowing subjects and known objects must exist. The world is not an unreality. If we do not admit distinctions of things, we cannot account

for distinctions of ideas. Our knowledge tells us that differences exist. We cannot regard them as merely conventional, for convention does not produce the distinctions.

The fact of difference is generally traced to the force of space and time, which are considered to be mere forms of the subject's intelligence. If space and time were identical with the knowing self, it is difficult to see how the notion that they are identical with the subject could arise. If the self as knowledge is all-pervading, we cannot have distinctions of space and time. To attribute the latter to the force of avidyā does not help us, since the status of avidyā and its relation to the self cannot be explained satisfactorily. Every explanation of avidyā implies the presuppositions of space and time, and so the latter cannot be explained away as the products of avidyā. Space and time are regarded as real wholes having parts. If they have no parts, we cannot have distinctions of here and there, now and then. We are presented with parts of space, for it is incorrect to hold that everything presented to us occupies all space, unlimited and indivisible. We are conscious only of limited bodies occupying portions of space and resisting one another. We perceive parts of space and time, and so they must be regarded as existing. According to Madhva, they are objects of perception to the witnessing self (sākṣin).

is of two kinds, according to Madhva, (svatantra) and dependent (paratantra). God, the supreme person, is the only independent reality. The dependent beings are of two kinds, positive (bhāva) and negative (abhāva). Of the positive we have two varieties, conscious (cetana) souls, and unconscious (acetana) entities, like matter and time. Unconscious existence is either eternal like the Vedas, eternal and non-eternal like prakṛti, time and space, or non-eternal like the products of prakṛti.[1]

IX

God

There are three entities existing from all eternity to all eternity, fundamentally different from one another, which are God, soul and the world. Though these are all real and

[1] According to *Madhvasiddhāntasāra* (2), there are ten padārthas. Dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣaviśiṣṭāṁśiśaktisādṛśyabhāvā daśa padārthāḥ.

eternal, the latter two are subordinate to God and dependent on him. Independent (svatantra) reality is Brahman, the absolute creator of the universe. We can know his nature through a study of the Vedas,[1] and so his nature is not indefinable. When the Supreme is said to be indefinable, all that is meant is that a complete knowledge of him is difficult to acquire.[2] The Supreme transcends all perception.[3] The form seen during meditation by imagination is not Brahman. Madhva has no sympathy with the view that the different parts of the scripture relate to different kinds of Brahman. Though the supreme being and his qualities are identical, they can be spoken of in different terms.[4] The famous passage that Brahman is one only without a second (ekam evādvitīyam brahma) means that Brahman is unsurpassed in excellence and without an equal, since it penetrates everywhere. The attributes of God are absolute in their character and so do not limit him. Brahman possesses every kind of perfection. He is identified with Viṣṇu and is said to direct by his will the world and all that is in it as an absolute ruler. He creates and destroys the world again and again. He is endowed with a supernatural body and is regarded as transcendent to the world as well as immanent, since he is the inner ruler (antaryāmin) of all souls.[5] He manifests himself in various forms (vyūhas), appears periodically in incarnations (avatāras), and is said to be mystically present in the sacred images. He creates, maintains and destroys the universe, imparts knowledge, manifests himself in several ways, condemns some and redeems others. By his side is Lakṣmī, capable of assuming various forms, but without a material body, coeternal with him and all-pervading. She witnesses the glory of God through eternity. Unlike the gods and goddesses who acquire release after many existences, Lakṣmī is eternally redeemed (nityamuktā). Lakṣmī is the personification of God's creative energy. She is intelligent prakṛti, though God is greater than she in point of subtlety and the extent of qualities.[6] God rules the souls and matter, though he does not create them

[1] M.B., iii. 3. 1. [2] M.B., i. 1. 5. [3] M.B., iii. 2. 23.

[4] See *Nyāyasudhā*, i. 1. 2; i. 1. 6. Cp. also *Madhvasiddhāntasāra*: Bhedābhāve 'pi bhedavyavahāranirvāhakā anantā eva viśeṣāḥ (21).

[5] i. 2. 13. [6] iv. 2. 9.

from nothing or reduce them to nothing. He is the efficient but not the material cause of the universe. An unintelligent world cannot be produced by a supreme intelligence. God's activity is the result of his overflowing perfection. Simply because God takes into account the karma of the individuals, it cannot be said that the Lord is dependent on karma, for, as Madhva says, " the very existence of karma and other things depends on the Lord." [1]

X

THE INDIVIDUAL SOUL

Everything on earth is, according to Madhva, a living organism. The universe is a vast expansion of animated nature with every atom of space filled up with jīvas. In his *Tattvanirṇaya*, he says, " Infinite are the souls dwelling in an atom of space." [2] Madhva regards the distinction between Brahman and jīva as real,[3] and holds that it is wrong to think that the jīva and Brahman are non-difterent in release and different in saṁsāra, since two different things cannot at any time become non-different or *vice versa.* Though absolutely dependent on Brahman, the jīvas are essentially active agents and have responsibilities to bear.[4] The soul is not an absolute agent, since it is of limited power, depending, as it does, on the guidance of the Lord.[5] The jīva is said to be of atomic size as distinct from Brahman who is all-pervading.[6] Though limited in size, it pervades the body on account of its quality of intelligence. The organ of knowledge is called sākṣin, to which the material manas presents its impressions. It is the cognising principle to which is due the consciousness of I-ness, which is the basis of individuality. The soul is by nature blissful, though it is subject to pain and suffering, on account of its connection with material bodies due to its past karma. So long as it is not freed from its impurities, it wanders about in changing forms of existence. The qualities

[1] ii. 1. 37; iii. 2. 39–42.
[2] Paramāṇupradeśeṣv anantāḥ prāṇirāśayaḥ.
[3] i. 2. 12.
[4] ii. 3. 33–42.
[5] ii. 3. 38; ii. 3. 28.
[6] ii. 3. 23.

like bliss become manifest at the time of release.[1] Though the souls are eternal, they are said to be born with reference to their embodied connection.[2] No two jīvas are alike in character. Each has its own worth and place in the scale of existence. The jīvas are dependent on the Lord, who, however, impels them to action according to their previous conduct.[3]

The conscious souls are of three kinds: (1) those eternally free (nitya), like Lakṣmī; (2) those who have freed themselves from saṁsāra (mukta) devas and men, ṛṣis and fathers; and (3) the bound (baddha). The last class includes both those who are eligible for release (muktiyogya) and those who are not eligible for it. These latter are either those intended for hell or the blinding darkness (tamoyogya) or those who are bound to the circuit of saṁsāra for all time (nityasaṁsāriṇaḥ). While some are preordained for salvation by their inherent aptitude, others are destined for hell, while a third class keeps revolving on the wheels of saṁsāra from eternity to eternity, now enjoying, now suffering, in endless alternation. This threefold classification is based on the three guṇas. The sāttvika soul goes to heaven, the rājasa revolves in saṁsāra, while the tāmasa falls into hell. The living beings are divided into a number of classes, gods (devas), men, animals and plants. A fixed gradation dependent on distinctions (tāratamya) of souls is worked out on an elaborate scale. Even among the souls who are entitled to salvation, no two souls possess the same degree of eligibility. In the celestial hierarchy, Brahmā and Vāyu occupy the most prominent places. At Viṣṇu's command, Brahmā creates the world. He is also the greatest teacher and the first exponent of Madhva's philosophy, which is also called Brahmasampradāya. Vāyu is the mediator between God and the souls. He helps the souls to gain saving knowledge and obtain release. He is also called the dearest image (pratimā preyasī) or the son of God (hareḥ sutaḥ).[4] It is not right to hold that the souls are Brahman. The perfect and the imperfect souls cannot merge together.

XI

The World of Nature

Material products are the objects of the inanimate world and form the bodies and organs of all beings. They all

[1] ii. 3. 31.
[2] Madhva on B.S., ii. 3. 19.
[3] ii. 3. 41–42. Even the rise of dreams is assigned to the will of God (iii. 2. 3 and 5).
[4] Madhva is regarded by his followers as the incarnation of Vāyu, who manifested himself in previous lives as Hanumān and Bhīma.

originate from the primary matter, prakṛti, and return to it in course of time. Though prakṛti appears to be homogeneous, it is really composed of different principles in a subtle state. It develops into the perceptible universe when worked up by God and the souls. God moulds forms out of prakṛti, which is the material cause and in which he exists himself in various forms.[1] Before we get from the unmanifested prakṛti to the well developed forms of creation, we have twenty-four transitional products of creation which are mahat, ahaṁkāra buddhi, manas, ten senses, five sense-objects and the five great elements. These exist in the primordial prakṛti in subtle forms before their evolution.

The three aspects of prakṛti are presided over by the three forms of Lakṣmī, Śrī, Bhū, and Durgā. Avidyā is a form of prakṛti of which there are two kinds, jīvācchādika, or that which obscures the spiritual powers of the jīva, and paramācchādika, or that which screens off the Supreme from the jīva's view. These two forms of avidyā are positive principles formed out of the substance of prakṛti.

XII

God and the World

Madhva rejects all attempts to reduce the world of souls and nature to a mere illusion or an emanation of God, and sets forth an absolute dualism. The individual soul is dependent (paratantra) on God, since it is unable to exist without the energising support of the universal spirit, even as the tree cannot live and thrive without its sap. Even Lakṣmī, the consort of Viṣṇu, though supreme and eternal, is dependent on God. She is the presiding deity over prakṛti, which is the material cause of the world. Īśvara somehow energises prakṛti, which forms no part of his being. Prakṛti somehow lends itself to the control of Īśvara.

Madhva comes into conflict with many scriptural passages, which he strains to make them yield a dualism. Taking the

[1] i. 4. 25.

great text, "Tat tvam asi" ("That art thou"), Madhva argues that it does not declare any identity between God and the soul. It only states that the soul has for its essence ... to those of God.[1] This is also the meaning of passages which declare that the soul is a portion of the Lord.[2] He sometimes reads the passage in a different way. Sa ātmā tat tvam asi, is read as sa ātmā atat tvam asi. "That ātman, thou art not."[3] Regarding the text, "ayam ātmā Brahma," Madhva says that it is either a simple eulogy of the jīvātman or it is a subject for meditation. It is also suggested that it is a pūrvapakṣa to be overthrown. Madhva uses the etymological meanings of Ātman and Brahman to explain away the passages which identify the individual and the universal self. The Ātman is Brahman, since it grows (vardhanaśīlaḥ) or since it penetrates everywhere (atanaśīlaḥ).

The supremacy of God introduces order and unity into the universe, in spite of ultimate differences. Through the category of viśeṣa, which distinguishes a quality from a substance, a part from whole, the one and the many are brought into relation.[4] Viśeṣa or particularity is numerically infinite, since it abides in eternal and non-eternal things and belongs to positive and negative being. One kind of negative being is distinguished from another by means of viśeṣa. But how can one viśeṣa be distinguished from another? If it is through another viśeṣa, then we are faced with infinite regress. So viśeṣa is said to be self-determined. By means of the category of viśeṣa, it will be possible for us to account for the world of distinctions without assuming the latter as ultimate. It is through the functioning of viśeṣa that we have difference or bheda. If viśeṣa is different from the Supreme, it breaks the integrity of the Supreme; if it is non-different from it, we cannot call it viśeṣa.

[1] ii. 3. 29.

[2] B.G., xv. 7.

[3] S.B.H., Bṛh. Up., p. 114. See also Chān., vi. 8. 7. This passage is also regarded as equivalent to tvam tadīyo 'si, or tvam tasyāsi. See also *Tattvamuktāvali*, J.R.A.S., N.S., xv.

[4] *Nyāyāmṛta*, vol. iii, p. 137.

XIII

Ethics and Religion

It is knowledge that produces the feeling of absolute dependence on God and love for him.[1] A correct knowledge of all things, material and spiritual, leads to a knowledge of God, which naturally results in the love for God. Towards the close of his *Tattvaviveka*, Madhva says: "Surely *he* finds release from saṁsāra who understands that all this limited existence is ever under the control of Hari."

A sound moral life is a preliminary for salvation. The moral rules are to be obeyed and obligations fulfilled without any desire or claim for fruit. A virtuous life helps us to win insight into truth. We can gain true knowledge from a study of the Vedas, which must be carried out under the guidance of a proper teacher. Each individual has in him the capacity for the perception of a particular aspect of Brahman. The wise teacher will have to take account of these differences, for it is said "by the perception for which one is fit, final release is obtained, not by any other means."[2] Only gods and men of the three upper classes are allowed to study the Vedas, while women and Śūdras may draw the requisite knowledge from the Purāṇas and the Smṛtis. Madhva allows to all who can understand it the right to study the Vedānta.[3] Meditation, or the act of absorbing oneself as often and as intensely as possible in the glory of God, is advised. In the act of meditation the soul can by divine grace arrive at a direct intuitive realisation of God (aparokṣajñāna). When the soul has this vision, as steady as the sun and not merely as swift as lightning, its fetters fall off and it is said to be redeemed.

God cannot be approached directly. Vāyu is the mediator. The theory of grace adopted by Madhva reminds us of the Augustinian view. A man can never deserve to be saved. It is only through grace that he can be redeemed. God is not forced by any considerations of merit. He simply elects some for salvation and others for the opposite state. The divine

[1] iii. 3. 49. [2] M.B. iii. 3. 53. [3] i. 1 1.

will sets men free or casts them into bondage. But the Hindu tradition does not allow Madhva to hold that God's choice is arbitrary, unconditioned and groundless. Though, in a sense, the states of the soul are brought about by Brahman,[1] it is also admitted that the grace of the Lord is proportioned to the intensity of our devotion.[2] Our conduct cannot by itself lead us to freedom; God must co-operate. The Supreme who is non-manifested cannot be made manifested by the force of our efforts. He reveals himself when pleased with our devotion.[3] The grace of God responds to the faith of the worshipper. Different sects of the followers of Madhva emphasise, in different degrees, divine predestination and human freedom. Insight, devotion, performance of rites and ceremonies, are insisted on. Service of the Supreme consists in branding the body with Viṣṇu's symbols, giving the Lord's names to sons and others and worshipping him in word (veracity, sacred study), act (charity) and thought (mercy and faith). Worship of God is the indispensable, preliminary condition for obtaining divine grace. Works done with knowledge help us in the upward progress. Rites and sacrifices, as well as pilgrimages, are recommended. Animal sacrifices are forbidden, and those who undertake sacrifices are called upon to substitute animals made of flour for the living ones.

The soul may continue the bodily existence so long as its prārabdhakarma is operative, but when it departs from the body, it is freed absolutely. Absolute liberation and embodied life are not compatible. The author of the *Nyāyāmṛta* argues that he who has the vision of the truth but not the grace of God necessary to effect freedom, continues to live in the flesh. This is jīvanmukti. Complete freedom can be achieved only through the grace of God.

Release, according to the *Bhāgavata*, consists in a restoration to the pure spiritual existence (svarūpeṇa vyavasthitiḥ), after casting off the unessential forms (anyathārūpam).[4] It is fellowship with God, and not identification with him. If the distinction between the jīva and the Lord is not perceived, as in deep sleep or destruction of the world, it is not a state

[1] iii. 2. 9. [2] iii. 2. 20–21. [3] iii. 2. 23–27.

[4] i. 1. 17. According to Madhva, mukti is svasvayogyasvasvarūpānandābhivyakti.

of release.[1] The freed retain their consciousness of individuality both in pralaya and creation. In the state of release, we have the absence of pain as well as the presence of positive enjoyment. But the soul is not capable of rising into equality with God. It is entitled only to serve him. If salvation is said to be becoming one with Brahman, it is only in a qualified sense that it has a vision of Brahman. Absolute one-ness is not intended by the passages which declare that "he who sees Brahman becomes Brahman." [2] The released are all of one will and purpose.[3] They have, no doubt, real desires; but their desires are one with those of the supreme Lord. They perform meditation at their pleasure.[4] They realise their wishes without any effort.[5] They assume a body of pure matter (śuddhasattva) of their own accord, though this body is not the product of karma; nor do they develop any attachment to the bodies they assume. Even if they do not assume such a body, they can experience bliss as we do in the case of dreams.[6]

While those who attain release escape from the world of saṁsāra, others pass on at death to a different existence, which is determined by the law of karma. At death the coarse body dissolves into its component parts, while the soul, clad in a body of fine imperceptible matter, together with the senses, goes either to the celestial regions, temporary hells, or gets into the luminous regions of the moon, where it stays for a time in accordance with its merit. Then it gets into the womb of the mother, where the soul's new earthly body is produced.[7] Thus rebirth continues till the soul develops love or hatred for God to the fullest extent, when it is released or cast into hell.

XIV

Critical Reflections

The fact of knowledge leads us to an organic conception of the world, but does not justify the division of the world

[1] S.B.H., Bṛh. Up., p. 118.
[2] *Tattvamuktāvali*, p. 55–56.
[3] iv. 2. 16.
[4] iii. 3. 27.
[5] iv. 4. 8.
[6] iv. 4. 10–16.
[7] iii. 1. 29.

into God, souls and objects externally related to one another. Nor can we understand the relation of the so-called essence or the individual soul to the universal principles operating in it. If God creates, if the beginning of the world-process is the result of the desire of the divine self, we may, no doubt, be able to account for creation. But the difficulty remains that whatever feels a want or has a desire is imperfect and limited. God, on such a view, cannot be regarded as the supreme perfection. The nature of the dependence of the world on God is not clearly brought out. If God were really independent, then there must not be anything to limit him from without. A dualism makes the independence of God impossible. Madhva conceives the infinite in an abstract manner, and is therefore not able to see any unity between it and the finite. If Brahman is co-eternal with the world, what is the relation between the two? If it is also a co-eternal relation, is the supreme spirit bound to objects other than itself? We cannot say that it is the nature of the supreme spirit to stand related to the individual souls, since the former does not contain the reason of the latter's existence. It is difficult to believe that the essence of God involves a relation to objects whose existence it does not necessitate. It is equally difficult to hold that the relation is a non-essential or accidental one, for an eternal accident, which subjects unborn spirits to itself and binds down the Supreme also, cannot be a mere accident. If the souls and matter depend on the ultimate Brahman, they cannot be regarded as substances. In the highest sense, the term "substance" can be predicated only of a *res completa*, that which is complete in itself, determined by itself and capable of being explained entirely from itself. Madhva recognises that such a reality is possessed only by the supreme spirit. All else is produced from Viṣṇu, the supreme spirit, directly or indirectly. Even his consort Śrī and his son Vāyu are entirely dependent on him. But the admission of Viṣṇu as the supreme reality of the world does not involve the denial of derivative and dependent being to other objects.

Again, the theory of election is fraught with great danger to ethical life. The predestinarian scheme of thought puts an excessive strain on the other parts of Madhva's theology.

The moral character of God is much compromised and the qualities of divine justice and divine love are emptied of all meaning and value. Individual effort loses its point, since whether one believes oneself to be the elect or the non-elect, one is bound to lapse into indifferentism and apathy. If we do not know what we are destined for, we may work on to purify ourselves. In the absence of knowledge we may at least have hope. But this theory will overwhelm us in despair and raise the question: Is not God playing a practical joke on us, when he implants in us a desire for heaven while making us unfit for it? Unless we are in a position to believe in the spiritual possibilities of every one who bears the human form divine, we cannot have a really useful ethics. In certain passages Madhva says that the individual soul is of the form of knowledge and bliss, though it is not conscious of this nature, while God is eternally conscious that he is of the nature of knowledge and bliss. The distinction, therefore, between God and man, however great, is not one of kind. The essence of each soul may perhaps represent its degree of obscuration, but it is difficult to prove that there are eternal essences persisting in souls even when they are released. In all this we are simply transferring the distinctions of experience to the kingdom of God.

XV

Nimbārka

Nimbārka was a Telugu Brahmin of the Vaiṣṇava faith who lived some time after Rāmānuja and prior to Madhva, about the eleventh century A.D. He wrote a short commentary on the *Brahma Sūtra* called *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, as well as ten verses, *Daśaślokī*, elucidating his view of the distinctness of Jīva, Īśvara and Jagat. His theory is called dvaitādvaita, or dualistic non-dualism. Keśavakāśmīrin wrote a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* called *Tattvaprakāśikā*, in defence of Nimbārka's general view. His commentary on the *Brahma Sūtra* develops the theory of the transformation (pariṇāma) of Brahman. A distinction is made between the independent reality of Puruṣottama and the dependent realities of jīva and prakṛti. While both jīva and Īśvara are self-conscious, the former is limited, while the latter is not. While the jīva is the enjoyer (bhoktṛ), the world is the enjoyed (bhogya), and Īśvara or God is the supreme controller (niyantṛ).

According to Nimbārka's teaching the jīva is of the form of knowledge (jñānasvarūpa), though not in Śaṁkara's sense. It is knowledge as well as the possessor of knowledge, even as the sun is light as well as the source of light. The relation of soul to its attribute is that of the dharmin (the qualified) to the dharma (the qualification). It is one of difference as well as non-difference. Between the qualification and the qualified there is no absolute identity, but only the non-perception of the difference. Though jīva is atomic in size, on account of its possession of the omnipresent quality of knowledge, it is able to experience the pleasures and the pains throughout the body.[1] The jīva is the agent of activity (kartṛ). The scriptural texts which deny activity are intended to bring out the dependent character of the activity of the jīva. The jīva has no independent (svatantra) knowledge or activity. Ānanda or delight pertains to the jīva in all its states. The jīva continues to exist in dreamless sleep and the state of release. As Īśvara is the governor, the jīva in all its states has the nature of being governed (niyāmyatva). The number of jīvas is infinite, though they are all sustained by the supreme spirit.

The inanimate world has three principal categories (tattvas), which are: (1) aprākṛta or what is not derived from the primordial prakṛti, such as the stuff of the divine body akin to Rāmānuja's śuddhasattva, which is the basis of the nitya-vibhūti of Īśvara; (2) prakṛti, or what is derived from prakṛti with its three guṇas; and (3) kāla, or time. Prakṛti and kāla are the basic principles of cosmic existence. These three categories are also eternal like the individual souls.

The eternal nature of Īśvara is to govern (niyantṛtva). Nimbārka and Keśava refute the predicateless character of Brahman and attribute to the latter good and auspicious qualities.[2] The supreme spirit is identified by Nimbārka with Kṛṣṇa, and is regarded as possessing all auspicious qualities and exempt from the faults of egoism, ignorance, passion and attachment. He has the four forms (vyūhas), and also mani-

[1] ii. 3. 25.

[2] Keśava says: 'Nāpi nirdharmakam brahma tasya jñānakriyādīnāṁ svābhāvikaśaktīnāṁ śāstrasiddhatvāt" (i. 1. 5). Again: "Ānandamaya-śabdanirdiṣṭa ātmā brahmaiva" (i. 1. 13).

fests himself in the avatāras, or incarnations. He is the material and the efficient cause of the universe. He is the material cause, since creation means the manifestation of his powers (śakti) of cit and acit in their subtle forms. He is the efficient cause of the universe, since he brings about the union of the individual souls with their respective karmas and their results and the proper instruments for experiencing them.

The universe cannot be dismissed as a mere illusion, since it is a manifestation (pariṇāma) of what is contained subtly in the nature of God. Nimbārka criticises the vivarta (illusion) theory of the world, and argues that, if the world were not real, it could not be superimposed on another.

The relation of the three principles of jīva, the world and God, is not one of absolute identity or non-distinction, since such a view would contradict numberless passages of the Upaniṣads which insist on difference and will also involve confusion between the natures and attributes of the different principles. Nor can it be said that the three principles are absolutely distinct, since this would be to fly in the face of the monistic evidence of the Upaniṣads. Were the supreme spirit absolutely distinct from the individual soul and the world, it could not be omnipresent. It would be as limited as the individual soul or the world, and could not, therefore, be regarded as their governor. The suggestion that non-difference is the reality while difference is due to upādhis or limitations cannot be accepted, since it would be to subject Brahman to conditions. On such a view, Brahman would cease to be pure and become subject to faults, and would experience pleasure, pain and the like, and all this would be contrary to the accepted nature of Brahman. So Nimbārka concludes that both difference and non-difference are real. The soul and the world are different from Brahman, since they possess natures and attributes different from those of Brahman. They are not different, since they cannot exist by themselves and depend absolutely on Brahman. The difference signifies distinct and dependent existence (paratantrasattābhāvaḥ), and non-difference signifies the impossibility of independent existence (svatantrasattā'bhāvah). In the light of this doctrine of difference-non-difference, the famous text, "Tat

tvam asi," is interpreted. "Tat" signifies the eternal omnipresent Brahman; "tvam" refers to the individual soul, whose existence depends on Brahman; and "asi" brings out the relation between the two, which is one of difference compatible with non-difference. Such a relation subsists between the sun and its rays or the fire and its sparks. Though souls and matter are distinct from God, they are yet intimately connected with him, as waves with water or coils of a rope with the rope itself. They are both distinct and non-distinct from Brahman. We need not regard the distincts as mutually exclusive and absolutely cut off from each other. Difference and identity are both equally real, and what is different is also identical.

Yet the individual souls and the world are not self-sufficient, but are guided by Īśvara.[1] In pralaya, these two get absorbed into the nature of Īśvara, who contains the subtle forms of jīva and jagat. Between the periods of dissolution and re-creation, all existence, conscious and unconscious, dwells in him in a subtle state. Through Brahman's śakti, or energy, the world is produced where each separate soul finds fit embodiment.

Nimbārka does not accept the theory that the conscious and the unconscious worlds form, together with Brahman, a composite personality, which is the material cause of the world, so far as the body of that personality goes. According to him, the śakti of Brahman is the material cause of the world, and the changes of śakti do not touch the integrity of Brahman. What Rāmānuja calls the "body" of Brahman is the śakti of Nimbārka. God does not stand in need of materials to construct the world. He is all-powerful, and by his mere will he is able to create the world.[2] Brahman is thus both the efficient and the material cause of the world. The world is identical with Brahman, and depends on him for its becoming and its power to act; and yet, in a sense, it is distinct from Brahman. The usual theory which traces the evolution of nature to the three guṇas is accepted.[3]

The supreme spirit is conceived as free from all defects, a storehouse of all beneficent attributes, possessed of a

[1] *Daśaślokī*, 7. [2] i. 1. 19. [3] *Daśaślokī*, 3.

heavenly body, full of beauty and tenderness, sweetness and charm.[1] Souls are infinite in number and are atomic is size. Each soul is a ray of Brahman individualised.[2] The theory attempts to avoid the affirmation of an absolute identity, where attributes are confused and distinctions abolished, and, at the same time, tries to escape from mere pluralism, which would impair the omnipresence of Brahman and limit his nature and sovereignty.

The pure nature of the jīva is obscured by its karma, which is the result of avidyā, which is beginningless, yet through the grace of God can be terminated. Prapatti, or complete submission to God, is the way to deliverance. Those who possess this attitude of prapannas are favoured by God, who engenders in them bhakti or devotion, which eventually results in brahmasākṣātkāra or realisation of God. Bhakti involves a knowledge of the supreme reality, the nature of the individual soul, the fruit of divine grace or mokṣa, which is an uninterrupted realisation of the nature and attributes of Brahman, resulting in the absolute destruction of all selfishness and ignorance, and the nature of the hindrances to God-realisation, such as the erroneous identification of the soul with the body, the senses or the mind, dependence on another than God, violation of or indifference to his commandments, and confusion of God with ordinary beings, the sense of freedom and joy born of true devotion. In Nimbārka Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā[3] take the place of Nārāyaṇa and his consort. Bhakti is not meditation (upāsana), but love and devotion. The grace of God is ever ready to lift up the helpless and make them see the truth of things. The worship of other gods is forbidden. Ethical rules, prescribed in the śāstras, are insisted on. Karma is said to be the means for the acquisition of brahmajñāna,[4] carrying with it devotion.[5]

While both Rāmānuja and Nimbārka regard difference and non-difference as necessary, and treat animate and inanimate existences as attributes of Brahman, Rāmānuja emphasises more the principle of identity. For Nimbārka the two are equally real and have the same importance. Again, Rāmānuja regards the individual souls (cit) and the

[1] *Daśaślokī*, 4.
[2] Commentary on the B.S., ii. 3. 42.
[3] *Daśaślokī*, 5 and 8.
[4] i. 1. 4.
[5] i. 1. 7.

world (acit) as the attributes (viśeṣaṇas or prakāras) of Brahman; and his view emphasises the non-duality of the supreme Lord, qualified by the individual souls and the world.[1] Nimbārka disputes this view on the ground that the presence of a body does not necessarily imply the possession of attributes; for an attribute has for its object the distinction of the thing which possesses it from others which do not possess it. If cit and acit are the attributes of Brahman, then, what is that reality from which Brahman is distinguished by the possession of these marks?

XVI

VALLABHA

Vallabha (1401 A.D.) is a Telugu Brahmin of South India, who migrated to the north and developed the views of Viṣṇusvāmin, who belonged to the thirteenth century. He accepts the authority not only of the Upaniṣads, the *Bhagavad-gītā* and the *Brahma Sūtra*, but also of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. In his works, *Aṇubhāsya*, *Siddhāntarahasya* and *Bhāgavata-ṭīkāsubodhini*,[2] he offers a theistic interpretation of the Vedānta, which differs from those of Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja. His view is called Śuddhādvaita, or pure non-dualism,[3] and declares that the whole world is real and is subtly Brahman. The individual souls and the inanimate world are in essence one with Brahman. Vallabha admits that jīva, kāla or time, and prakṛti or māyā, are eternal existences; they are referred to the being of Brahman and have no separate existence. Those who accept the force of māyā as the explanation of the world are not pure Advaitins, since they admit a second to Brahman.[4] While Śaṁkara traces the world to Brahman through the force of māyā, Vallabha holds that Brahman can create the world without any connection with such a principle as māyā. In his view the śāstra is the final authority, and our reason cannot protest against its dictates.[5] God is

[1] Cidacidviśiṣṭaparameśvarādvaita.

[2] Giridhara's *Śuddhādvaitamārtāṇḍa* and Bālakṛṣṇa's *Prameyaratnārṇava* belong to this sect.

[3] As distinct from Śaṁkara's Kevalādvaita.

[4] i. 1. 6.

[5] i. 1. 20.

saccidānanda, and has qualities; the śruti passages which declare that he has no qualities mean merely that he has not the ordinary qualities.[1] God is personified as Kṛṣṇa, when he is endowed with the qualities of wisdom (jñāna) and action (kriyā). He is the creator of the world, and we need not suppose that he should possess a physical body as worldly agents do, since what applies to us need not apply to the transcendent God. By the mere force of his will he creates the whole world. Not only is he kartā or agent, but also enjoyer or bhokta.[2] Though he has no need to assume a body, he appears in various forms to please his devotees.[3] The highest, when associated with action only, is yajñarūpa, who can be propitiated by karmas, as stated in the Brāhmaṇas; when associated with wisdom, it is Brahman, and can be approached through jñāna, as stated in the Upaniṣads. Kṛṣṇa the Supreme has to be worshipped according to the principles of the *Gītā* and the *Bhāgavata*.

In human and animal souls the quality of ānanda is suppressed, while in matter consciousness is also suppressed. Brahman becomes whatever it wills by the evolution (āvirbhāva) and involution (tirobhāva) of its qualities. The jīva is atomic in size,[4] is one with Brahman, and constitutes a part of it.[5] When the ānanda of Brahman is obscured, we have the jīva. Though its production is only a manifestation, it is as real and eternal as Brahman. Three kinds of jīvas are distinguished. The pure (śuddha) jīvas are those whose lordly qualities (aiśvarya) are not obscured by the force of ignorance (avidyā). The mundane (saṁsārin) jīvas are those which are caught in the meshes of avidyā, and experience birth and death by reason of their connection with gross and subtle bodies. The liberated (mukta) jīvas are those which are freed from the bonds of saṁsāra through insight into truth (vidyā). When the soul attains release, it recovers its suppressed qualities and becomes one with God. The inanimate world is also filled with Brahman (brahmātmaka). In it the two qualities of Brahman, knowledge and bliss, are obscured, and what remains is pure sattva or existence. Since it is Brahman that is manifested in the form of the world, the

[1] See his commentary on B.S., iii. 2. 22.
[2] i. 1. 1.
[3] i. 1. 20–21.
[4] ii. 3. 19.
[5] ii. 3. 43.

latter is regarded as the effect of Brahman (brahmakārya). Creation and destruction of the world are only the manifestation and non-manifestation of the Supreme who puts on these forms. Brahman becomes a product and is apprehended in the state of creation, while in destruction the world returns to its original form, and ceases to be an object of perception. The world is therefore as eternal and real as Brahman himself, and its creation and destruction are due to the power (śakti) of Brahman. The world cannot be regarded as an illusory appearance; nor is it essentially different from Brahman. The relation of cause and effect is one of absolute identity.[1] The universe in truth is Brahman. Brahman manifests himself of his own will, as the individual souls and the world, without undergoing any change in his essential nature. He is the material as well as the efficient cause of the world.[2] The charges of partiality and cruelty cannot be urged against Brahman, since the difference of the jīvas from Brahman is admitted by Vallabha. He holds that the jīva, freed from the fetters of māyā, is one with Brahman.

Vallabha looks upon God as the whole and the individual as part; but, as the individual is of identical essence with God, there is no real difference between the two. The analogy of sparks to fire is employed to great purpose. The individual soul is not the Supreme clouded by the force of avidyā, but is itself Brahman, with one attribute rendered imperceptible. The soul is both a doer and an enjoyer. It is atomic in size, though pervading the whole body by its quality of intelligence, even as sandal-wood makes its presence felt where it does not exist, by its scent. For Rāmānuja, who accepts one ultimate substantive reality, the difference between God and soul is never destroyed. Rāmānuja relates God and the soul as whole and parts, where the parts are really different moments of the whole. His view of sāmānādhikaraṇya or viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāva points to the coinherence of many parts in the same whole. Vallabha, on the other hand, gives us something like Schelling's *neutrum*, where the differences are abolished, while Rāmānuja's view is more like Hegel's.

[1] Prāgabhāva, or prior non-existence, is the causal condition; pradhvaṁsābhāva is but disappearance of the effect.

[2] i. 1. 4.

The world of māyā is not regarded as unreal,[1] since māyā is nothing else than a power which Īśvara of his free will produces. " Brahman is the efficient and the material cause of the universe. He is not only the creator of the universe but is the universe itself." [2] He accepts the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* account,[3] that Brahman desired to become many, and himself became the multitude of individual souls and the world. A desire for self-expression is innate in Brahman. Māyā, according to Vallabha, is the power of Īśvara, through which he brings about the evolution and the dissolution of the world. Māyā is different from avidyā, which is responsible for the obscuration of the unity of things and the production of the consciousness of difference.[4] Vallabha does not admit an inert prakṛti which is energised by Brahman. Though Brahman in himself is not known, he is known when he manifests himself through the world.

Saṁsāra, however, is unreal. The soul is right in regarding the world as real, but is wrong when it ascribes to it plurality. The world is true, though our experience (pratīti) of it is wrong. We do not realise that the world is but a form of Brahman. The jīva is thus infected with a wrong view of the nature of the world. To those who have attained to the truth, the world appears as Brahman. To those who have learnt the truth from the scriptures, it appears as both Brahman and māyā, *i.e.* something other than Brahman, though they know that the former is real and the latter not. The ignorant make no distinction between the reality of Brahman and the unreality of the plural appearances which set themselves forth as objective and independent. Avidyā is located in the mind of man. Vallabha thus does not accept the view of the unreality of the world as such. If the world is unreal, we cannot even say that it is one with Brahman, since a relation of identity cannot exist between a real entity and an unreal appearance. There is a possibility of deception, though it is not divinely conditioned.

The jīva bound by māyā cannot attain salvation except through the grace of God. Bhakti is the chief means of salvation, though jñāna is also useful. All sins are put away

[1] *Aṇubhāṣya* on i. 1. 4.
[2] *Aṇubhāṣya*, i. 1. 4.
[3] i. 4. 3.
[4] See

if we have true faith in God, a principle that was much exaggerated in practice. Vallabha deprecated all kinds of self-mortification. The body is the temple of God, and there is no meaning in attempting to destroy it. Karmas precede knowledge of the Supreme, and are present even when this knowledge is gained. The liberated perform all karmas.[1] The highest goal is not ṁukti or liberation, but rather eternal service of Kṛṣṇa and participation in his sports in the celestial Bṛndāvana. Vallabha distinguishes the transcendent consciousness of Brahman from Puruṣottama.[2] The souls, delivered from the trammels of life, are of different kinds. There are those who have freed themselves from previous subjection, like Sanaka, and those who dwell in the city of God, where they attain freedom through the grace of God. There are others who resort to bhakti and develop perfect love and become the associates of God. Vallabha lays great stress on a life of unqualified love to God.

The relation between Brahman on the one side and the individual souls (jīva) and the inanimate nature (jaḍa) on the other, is one of pure identity, even as the relation of whole (aṁśin) and part (aṁśa) is. While the difference is subordinated by Vallabha, non-difference alone is said to be real. He interprets " Tat tvam asi " (" That art thou ") as literally true, while Rāmānuja and Nimbārka take it in a figurative sense. When the soul attains bliss, and the inanimate world both consciousness and bliss, the difference between Brahman and these will lapse—a position which Rāmānuja does not accept.

XVII

The Caitanya Movement

The Vaiṣṇavism of South India did not pay much attention to the glorification of the Bṛndāvana līlā, though some of the Āḷvārs refer to Kṛṣṇa's sports with the gopis. In the north, however, the case was different. In Nimbārka, Rādhā, the beloved mistress, is not simply the chief of the gopis but is the eternal consort of Kṛṣṇa. The writings of Jayadeva, the author of *Gītagovinda*, Vidyāpati, Umāpati and Caṇḍi Dās (fourteenth century), show the growing influence of

[1] *Aṇubhāṣya*, i. 1. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*, iv. 3. 27.

the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa cult in Bengal and Bihar, thanks to the influence of the Śākta system of thought and practice. Trained in such an atmosphere, Caitanya, the great Vaiṣṇava teacher (fifteenth century), was attracted by the account of Kṛṣṇa in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, *Harivaṁśa*, the *Bhāgavata* and the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇas*, and by his personality and character gave a new form to the Vaiṣṇava faith. His breadth of view and democratic sympathies gave him a large following, though the orthodox were much disturbed by his startling ways. He accepted converts from Islam freely, and one of the earliest of his disciples was a Moslem fakir, who attained to great fame and sanctity in the sect under the name of Haridās. His disciples, Rūpa and Sanātana, were renegade converts to Islam and outcasts from the Hindu society, whom Caitanya welcomed back into the fold. Jīva Gosvāmi (sixteenth century) and much later Baladeva, furnished the philosophical basis for the sect. The philosophical classics of the school are Jīva's *Satsandarbha* and his own commentary on it, *Sarvasaṁvādinī*, and Baladeva's *Govindabhāṣya* on the *Brahma Sūtra*. The latter's *Prameyaratnāvali* is also a popular work. These writers are influenced considerably by the views of Rāmānuja and Madhva.[1] They admit the five principles of God, souls, māyā or prakṛti, and svarūpaśakti, with its two elements of jñāna or knowledge, śuddhatattva or pure matter, and kāla, or time.

On the question of the theory of knowledge, there is not much that is peculiar to the school. The traditional account of the sources of knowledge, including Vedic testimony, is accepted. Jīva argues that there is such a state of consciousness as simple apprehension, which is later developed into determinate knowledge. Non-relational immediate experience precedes determinate cognition. The former is indeterminate (nirvikalpa) cognition. The determinate is contained potentially in it. It is the fact given in indeterminate perception that is analysed and understood in the determinate. It follows that indeterminate cognition is a fact of consciousness; and the intuition, where relations seem to be absent, is of this kind. Jīva does not believe in a universal which includes all differences.[2] We have first the knowledge of the universal as such and then the universal as qualified. The intuition of Brahman, pure and simple, is, for Jīva, an undoubted fact of consciousness, though it requires to be transcended.

The ultimate reality is Viṣṇu, the personal God of love and grace, possessing the usual attributes of sat, cit and ānanda. He is nirguṇa, in the sense that he is free from the

[1] *Prameyaratnāvali*, p. 8. [2] *Bhāgavatsandarbha*, p. 55.

qualities of prakṛti and saguṇa, since he has the qualities of omniscience, omnipotence, etc. These qualities are bound to him by the relation of svarūpasaṁbandha. They express the nature of Brahman and inhere in him.[1] He is the source, support and end of the world, the material and the efficient cause of the universe.[2] He is the efficient cause through his higher energy (parā śakti),[3] and material cause through his other energies, called aparā śakti and avidyāśakti. His former nature is unchangeable, while his latter is subject to modifications. The chief character of God is love[4] and the power of joy. The incarnations are one with the Supreme and not parts, as the individuals are.[5] God assumes infinite forms, of which the chief is that of Kṛṣṇa, whose supreme delight is in love. Kṛṣṇa, when identified with the Supreme, has three chief powers, cit, māyā and jīva. By the first he maintains his nature as intelligence and will, by the second the whole creation is produced, and by the third the souls. The highest manifestation of the cit power of Kṛṣṇa is the power of delight (hlādinī). Rādhā is the essence of this delight-giving power.[6] According to Jīva, God is one without a second. He is Brahman when viewed in himself and Bhagavān when viewed as the creator of the world. The former is abstract and the latter concrete. Jīva holds that the latter is the more real. According to Baladeva, the Supreme is called Hari, his Majesty and magnificance are personified as Nārāyaṇa, and his beauty and ecstasy as Kṛṣṇa.

The universe and its creatures have come into being through the powers of God. They are dependent on him, though separate and distinct from him. They are neither one with God nor different from him. An incomprehensible difference-

[1] Baladeva, after Madhva, admits the doctrine of viśeṣa, though he confines it to the svarūpaśakti and its modification; since the distinctions of the world are established facts and do not require any viśeṣa to distinguish them.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 4. 24.

[3] Identified with Śrī. See Baladeva, iii. 3. 40 and 42.

[4] Prītyātmā, iv. 1. 1.

[5] A distinction is made between svāṁśa, or a manifestation identical with the original, and vibhinnāṁśa, or a part separate from the original. See Baladeva, ii. 3. 47.

[6] Cp. " Kṛṣṇasvarūpiṇī paramānandarūpiṇī " (*Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*, v. 4. 17).

non-difference[1] is the truth of things. The world is real and not illusory; it is called māyā on account of its nature, since it attracts men to itself and away from God. The servant of God becomes, through the power of māyā, the slave of the world.

The soul is different from the Lord, who is its ruler. God is omnipresent while the soul is of atomic size.[2] God's svarūpaśakti, according to Jīva, supports his jīva śakti (also called taṭasthaśakti) by which the souls are created. This latter in its turn supports māyāśakti (or bahiraṅgaśakti). None of these can exist apart from God At the time of creation, the Supreme remembers the constitution of the world immediately preceding the pralaya and desires to "become manifold," *i.e.* give separate existence to the enjoying souls and the objects of enjoyment merged in him. He creates the entire world from the great principle of mahat down to the cosmic egg and Brahmā. He then manifests the Vedas in the same order and arrangement as they had had before, and communicates them mentally to Brahmā, to whom other stages of creation are assigned. Through the help of the Vedas, Brahmā remembers the archetypal forms, and creates objects as in the previous existence. It follows that the Vedas, when they refer to Indra, etc., refer to types which do not perish, though the individuals do.[3] While Rāmānuja regards the souls and matter as the adjectives (viśeṣaṇas) of God, Jīva and Baladeva regard them as the manifestations of God's energy. The latter are averse to making unconscious prakṛti a predicate of God, which may introduce an element of discord into his nature. So Jīva makes prakṛti the outer energy (śakti) of God, which is not directly related to him, though under his control. Baladeva identifies māyā with prakṛti, which is set in motion by the mere sight (īkṣaṇa) of God.

The souls become fettered by the bonds of the world through the power of māyā, which makes them forget their real nature. The force of karma can be overcome if we have bhakti.[4] By the development of love (ruci) for Kṛṣṇa, we

[1] Acintyabhedābheda. [2] Baladeva, ii. 2. 41.

[3] Baladeva, i. 3. 30.

[4] Caitanya accepted the usual stages of bhakti: (1) śānta, or tranquil meditation on God; (2) dāsya, or active service of God; (3) sakhya, or friendship; (4) vātsalya, or parental tenderness; (5) mādhurya, or sweetness

can have intuition of the divine. God's affection for his creatures is said to be brought out in his love for Rādhā. It is the desire of the creator that his creatures should cleave to him only in the hope of salvation. Kāma or sexual love is distinguished from prema or spiritual love. Bhakti is the way to salvation. Study of the Vedas, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and the like, is inculcated. Reverence for the guru is a cardinal feature. In matters of religion it is said that reason is not to be depended upon. The distinctions of caste are ignored. No man or woman is too low for the grace of God. Ethical virtues of mercy towards all creatures, humility, tranquillity, freedom from worldly desires and purity of heart, are emphasised.

Salvation consists in the eternal experience of love (prīti).[1] Souls in heaven realise their status as the servants of God, and are utterly devoted to him. Love is release. Bhakti is the true mukti. Through it bondage to rebirth is broken, and the soul attains to a status of equality with God, though it is never absorbed in God.[2] The intuition of Brahman, as the abstract universal of all existence, is, according to Jīva, the prelude to the intuition of Bhagavān, who is the concrete reality of all existence and life. The former, due to knowledge, is not ultimate. The latter, due to bhakti, can be had only when the body is cast off. Though jīvanmukti is possible regarding the intuition of Brahman, it is of no avail for the love of the Bhagavān.

Jīva attempts to displace the theory of attributes (viśeṣaṇa) advocated by Rāmānuja, by his own theory of energy (śakti). But if God cannot possess an attribute opposed in nature to his being, how can he possess a power or energy which equally contradicts his being ? Though some of the writers belonging to this school call themselves the followers of Madhva, in their thought they are really nearer Rāmānuja, since they emphasise identity, even while they admit differences. The latter are traced to the śaktis, which belong to God in an inconceivable

symptomatic of conjugal love. Each stage includes the preceding, so that the last is the most complete. Bhakti literature of Bengal is full of acute analysis of feelings. See Rūpa's *Ujjvalanīlamaṇi*.

[1] Saccidānandaikarase bhaktiyoge tiṣṭhati (*Gopālatāpanī*). See Baladeva, iii. 3. 12.

[2] Baladeva on i. 1. 17.

(acintya) manner. Jīva admits in his *Sarvasaṁvādinī* that we cannot regard God and his powers as either identical or as different.

REFERENCES.

AVALON : Mahānirvāṇa Tantra.
AVALON : Śakti and Śākta.
BARNETT : The Heart of India.
CARPENTER : Mediæval Theism in India.
CHATTERJI : Kashmir Saivism.
MĀDHAVA : S.D.S., V, IX.
MADHVA : Commentaries on the Bhagavadgītā, Brahma Sūtra. Subba Rao's E.T.
NALLASVĀMI PIḶḶAI : Studies in Śaiva Siddhānta.
PADMANĀBHĀCĀRYA : Life and Teachings of Śrī Madhva.
POPE : Tiruvāśagam.
SRINIVASA IYENGAR : Outlines of Indian Philosophy, Chs. II and III.
Śivasūtravimarśinī.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSION

The course of Hindu philosophic development—The unity of the different systems—The decline of the philosophic spirit in recent times —Contact with the West—The present situation—Conservatism and radicalism—The future.

PHILOSOPHICAL DEVELOPMENT

THROUGHOUT the history of Indian thought, the ideal of a world behind the ordinary world of human strivings, more real and more intangible, which is the true home of the spirit, has been haunting the Indian race. Man's never-ceasing effort to read the riddle of the sphinx and raise himself above the level of the beast to a moral and spiritual height finds a striking illustration in India. We can watch the struggle for four millenniums (or longer, if the recent archæological finds in Sind and the Punjab, which are withdrawing the shroud that hid the remote past, are to be taken into account). The naïve belief that the world is ruled by the gods of Sun and Sky, who watch from on high the conduct of men, whether it is straight or crooked; the faith that the gods who can be persuaded by prayer or compelled by rites to grant our requests, are only the forms of the one Supreme; the firm conviction that the pure stainless spirit, to know whom is life eternal, is one with the innermost soul of man; the rise of materialism, scepticism and fatalism, and their supersession by the ethical systems of Buddhism and Jainism, with their central doctrine that one can free one-self from all ill only by refraining from all evil, in thought, word and deed—God or no God; the liberal theism of the *Bhagavadgītā*, which endows the all-soul with ethical in addition to metaphysical perfections; the logical

scheme of the Nyāya, which furnishes the principal categories of the world of knowledge which are in use even to-day; the Vaiśeṣika interpretation of nature; the Sāṁkhya speculations in science and psychology; the Yoga scheme of the pathway to perfection; the ethical and social regulations of the Mīmāṁsā and the religious interpretations of the Supreme reality, as put forward by Śaṁkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva and Nimbārka, Vallabha and Jīva Gosvāmi—form a remarkable record of philosophical development in the history of the human race. Type succeeds type, school follows on school, in logical sequence. The life of the Indian was ever on the move, shaping itself as it grew, and changing from time to time in relation to its physical, social and cultural contexts. In the early stages the ancient Indians were doing everything for the first time. They had practically no wisdom of the past to fall back upon. They had, moreover, enormous difficulties to contend with, which are now almost things of the past. In spite of these, their achievement in the realm of thought and practice is a considerable one. But the cycle is not complete, and the range of possible forms is not exhausted; for the sphinx still smiles. Philosophy is yet in its infancy.

The survey of Indian thought, as of all thought, impresses one with the mystery and the immensity of existence as well as the beauty and the persistence of the human effort to understand it. The long procession of thinkers struggled hard to add some small piece to the temple of human wisdom, some fresh fragment to the ever incomplete sum of human knowledge. But human speculation falls short of the ideal, which it can neither abandon nor attain. We are far more conscious of the depth of the surrounding darkness than of the power to dispel it possessed by the flickering torches that we have the privilege to carry as the inheritors of a great past. After all the attempts of philosophers, we stand to-day in relation to the ultimate problems very near where we stood far away in the ages—where perhaps we shall ever stand as long as we are human, bound Prometheus-like to the rock of mystery by the chains of our finite mind.[1] The pursuit of

[1] "No one," exclaims Xenophanes, "has attained complete certainty in respect to the gods and to that which I call universal nature, will nor

philosophy is not, however, a vain endeavour. It helps us to feel the grip and the clanging of the chains. It sharpens the consciousness of human imperfection, and thus deepens the sense of perfection in us, which reveals the imperfection of our passing lives. That the world is not so transparent to our intellects as we could wish is not to be wondered at, for the philosopher is only the lover of wisdom and not its possessor. It is not the end of the voyage that matters, but the voyage itself. To travel is a better thing than to arrive.

At the end of our course, we may ask whether the known facts of history support a belief in progress. Is the march of human thought a forward movement, or is it one of retrogression? The sequence is not capricious and unmeaning. India believes in progress, for, as we have already said, the cycles are bound together by an organic tie. The inner thread of continuity is never cut. Even the revolutions that threaten to engulf the past help to restore it. Backward eddies serve rather to strengthen than retard the current. Epochs of decadence, like the recent past of this country, are in truth periods of transition from an old life to a new. The two currents of progress and decline are intermingled. At one stage the forces of progress press forward with a persistent sweep, at another the line sways to and fro, and sometimes the forces of retrogression seem to overwhelm those of progress, but on the whole the record is one of advance. It would be idle to deny that much has perished in the process. But few things are more futile than to rail against the course which the historical past has taken or weep over it. In any case, some other kind of development would have been worse. The more important thing is the future. We are able to see further than our predecessors, since we can climb on their shoulders. Instead of resting content with the foundations nobly laid in the past, we must build a greater edifice in harmony with ancient endeavour as well as the modern outlook.

anyone ever attain it. Nay, even if a man happened to light on the truth, he would not know that he did so, for appearance is spread over all things" (Gomperz: *Greek Thinkers*, vol. i, p. 164).

II

The Unity of all Systems

The twin strands which in one shape or another run through all the efforts of the Indian thinkers are loyalty to tradition and devotion to truth. Every thinker recognises that the principles of his predecessors are stones built into the spiritual fabric, and, if they are traduced, one's own culture is defamed. A progressive people with a rich tradition cannot afford to neglect it, though it may contain elements which are not edifying. The thinkers try hard to explain, allegorise, alter and expurgate the traditional lore, since men's emotions are centred round it. The later Indian thinkers justify the different philosophical interpretations of the universe advanced by the earlier ones, and regard them as varying approximations to the truth as a whole. The different views are not looked upon as unrelated adventures of the human mind into the realm of the unknown or a collection of philosophical curiosities. They are regarded as the expression of a single mind, which has built up the great temple, though it is divided into numerous walls and vestibules, passages and pillars.

Logic and science, philosophy and religion are related organically. Every fresh epoch in the progress of thought has been inaugurated by a reform in logic. The problem of method, involving as it does an insight into the nature of human thought, is of great value. The Nyāya points out that no stable philosophy can be built except on the foundations of logic. The Vaiśeṣika warns us that all fruitful philosophy must take into account the constitution of physical nature. We cannot build in the clouds. Though physics and metaphysics are clearly distinct and cannot be blended, still a philosophic scheme must be in harmony with the results of natural science. But to extend to the universe at large what is true of the physical world would be to commit the fallacy of scientific metaphysics, and the Sāṁkhya asks us to beware of that danger. The resources of nature cannot generate consciousness. We cannot reduce nature and consciousness the one to the other, as scientific and psychological metaphysics attempt to do. Reality appears not only in

science and in human life, but in religious experience, which is the subject matter of the Yoga system. The Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and the Vedānta lay stress on ethics and religion. The relation between nature and mind is the supreme problem of philosophy which the Vedānta takes up. The saying, that the saints do not contradict one another, is true of philosophies also. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika realism, the Sāṁkhya-Yoga dualism and the Vedānta monism do not differ as true and false but as more or less true.[1] They are adapted to the needs of the slow-witted (mandādhikāri), the average intellect (madhyamādhikāri) and the strong-minded (uttamādhikāri) respectively. The different views are hewn out of one stone and belong to one whole, integral, entire and self-contained. No scheme of the universe can be regarded as complete, if it has not the different sides of logic and physics, psychology and ethics, metaphysics and religion. Every system of thought developed in India offered its own theory of knowledge, interpretation of nature and mind, ethics and religion. Our knowledge of the universe has grown enormously under the guidance of the natural sciences, and we cannot afford to be satisfied with any restricted outlook on life. The future attempts at philosophic construction will have to relate themselves to the recent advances of natural science and psychology.

III

Philosophy and Life

Philosophy has for its function the ordering of life and the guidance of action. It sits at the helm and directs our course through the changes and chances of the world. When philosophy is alive, it cannot be remote from the life of the people. The ideas of thinkers are evolved in the process of their life history. We must learn not only to reverence them,

[1] Mādhava S.D.S.; Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's *Prasthānabheda*; Vijñānabhikṣu's Introduction to S.P.B. Cp. Kant: "We are in a way maintaining the honour of human reason when we reconcile it with itself in the different persons of acute thinkers and discover the truth, which is never entirely missed by men of such thoroughness, even if they directly contradict each other" (quoted in J. Ward: *A Study of Kant*, p. 11, n. 1).

but to acquire their spirit. The names of Vaśiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra, Yājñavalkya and Gārgī, Buddha and Mahāvīra, Gautama and Kaṇāda, Kapila and Patañjali, Bādarāyaṇa and Jaimini, Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja, are not merely themes for the historian but types of personality. With them philosophy is a world-view based on reflection and experience. Thought, when it thinks itself out to the end, becomes religion by being lived and tested by the supreme test of life. The discipline of philosophy is at the same time the fulfilment of a religious vocation.

IV

The Decline of Philosophy in the Recent Past

The evidence brought together in this work does not support the general criticism that the Indian mind has a fear of thinking. We cannot dismiss the whole progress of Indian thought with a sapient reference to the oriental mind, which is not sufficiently dry and virile to rise above grotesque imagination and puerile mythology. Yet there is much in the thought-history of the last three or four centuries to lend countenance to this charge. India is no longer playing her historic rôle as the vanguard of higher knowledge in Asia.[1] It seems to some that the river that has flowed down the centuries so strong and full is likely to end in a stagnant waste of waters. The philosophers, or rather the writers on philosophy of this period of decadence, profess to be votaries

[1] Regarding China's debt to India, Professor Liang Chi Cho says: " India taught us to embrace the idea of absolute freedom, that fundamental freedom of mind, which enables it to shake off all the fetters of past tradition and habit as well as the present customs of a particular age—that spiritual freedom which casts off the enslaving forces of material existence. . . . India also taught us the idea of absolute love, that pure love towards all living beings which eliminates all obsessions of jealousy, anger, impatience, disgust and emulation, which expresses itself in deep pity and sympathy for the foolish, the wicked and the sinful—that absolute love which recognises the inseparability between all beings." He goes on to explain the contributions of India to Chinese literature and art, music and architecture, painting and sculpture, drama, poetry and fiction, astronomy and medicine, educational method and social organisations. See *Viśvabhārati Quarterly*, October 1924. The influence of India on Burma and Ceylon, Japan and Corea, is well known.

of truth, though they understand by it merely the pious sophistries or the sacrosanct hair-splittings of this or that school of dogmatics. These professional dialecticians imagine that the small brook by their side, trickling away in the sand or evaporating in the fog, is the broad river of Indian philosophy.

A variety of causes have contributed to this result. The political changes brought about by the establishment of the Mohammadan supremacy turned men's minds into conservative moulds. In an age when individual self-assertion and private judgment threatened at every point to dissolve into anarchy the old social order and all stable conviction, the need for authoritative control was urgently felt. The Mohammadan conquest, with its propagandist work, and later the Christian missionary movement, attempted to shake the stability of Hindu society, and in an age deeply conscious of instability, authority naturally became the rock on which alone it seemed that social safety and ethical order could be reared. The Hindu, in the face of the clash of cultures, fortified himself with conventions and barred all entry to invading ideas. His society, mistrusting reason and weary of argument, flung itself passionately into the arms of an authority which stamped all free questioning as sin. Since then it has failed in loyalty to its mission. There were no longer any thinkers, but only scholars who refused to strike new notes, and were content to raise echoes of the old call. For some centuries they succeeded in deceiving themselves with a supposedly final theory. Philosophy became confused with the history of philosophy when the creative spirit had left her. It abdicated its function and remained wrapped up in its illusions. When it ceased to be the guide and the guardian of the general reason, it did a great wrong to itself. Many believed that their race had travelled long and far towards a goal at which it had at length arrived. They felt rather tired and inclined to rest. Even those who knew that they had not arrived, and saw the large tract of the country stretching into the future, were afraid of the unknown and its ordeals. The silences and the eternities cannot be questioned without peril by the weak of heart. The dizziness of the inquiry into the infinite is a vertigo which even mighty minds try to avoid, if they can. The strongest

of human forces are subject to intervals of lethargy, and the philosophic impulse has had in these three or four centuries an attack of lethargy.

The Present Situation

To-day the great religions of the world and the different currents of thought have met on Indian soil. The contact with the spirit of the West has disturbed the placid contentment of recent times. The assimilation of a different culture has led to the impression that there are no official answers to ultimate problems. It has shaken the faith in the traditional solutions, and has, in some degree, helped to a larger freedom and flexibility of thought. Tradition has become fluid again, and while some thinkers are busy rebuilding the house on ancient foundations, others want to remove the foundations altogether. The present age of transition is as full of interest as of anxiety.

During the recent past, India was comfortably moored in a backwater outside the full current of contemporary thought, but she is no longer isolated from the rest of the world. The historian of three or four centuries hence may have much to say on the issues of the intercourse between India and Europe, but as yet they lie hidden from our view. So far as India is concerned, we notice the broadening of men's range of experience, the growth of the critical temper and a sort of distaste for mere speculation.

But there is another side to the picture. In the field of thought, as well as in that of action, the spirit of man is doomed to decay as much in anarchy as in bondage. There is not much to choose between the two, so far as culture and civilisation are concerned. Anarchy may mean material discomfort, economic ruin and social danger and bondage material comfort, economic stability and social peace. But it would be incorrect to confuse the standards of civilisation with economic welfare and maintenance of social order. It is easy to understand the feeling of the Indians of the beginning of the nineteenth century, who after generations of public strife and private

suffering welcomed the British rule as the dawn of a golden age; but it should be equally easy to sympathise with the Indian feeling of the present day that the spirit of man craves, not comfort, but happiness, not peace and order, but life and liberty, not economic stability or equitable administration, but the right to work out one's own salvation even at the cost of infinite toil and tribulation. Even non-political virtues do not thrive in the absence of political autonomy. British rule has given India peace and security, but they are not ends in themselves. If we are to put first things first, then we must admit that economic stability and political security are only means, however valuable and necessary, to spiritual freedom. A bureaucratic despotism which forgets the spiritual ends, for all its integrity and enlightenment, cannot invigorate the peoples beneath her sway, and cannot therefore evoke any living response in them. When the founts of life are drying up, when the ideals for which the race stood for millenniums, the glow of consciousness, the free exercise of faculty, the play of life, the pleasure of mind and the fulness of peace, prāṇārāmam, mana-ānandam, śānti-samṛddham, are decaying, it is no wonder that the Indian is conscious only of the crushing burden and not of the lifted weight. It is no use speaking to him of the magnitude of Britain's work, for the verdict of history is passed on the spiritual quality of the achievement. If the leaders of recent generations have been content to be mere echoes of the past and not independent voices, if they have been intellectual middlemen and not original thinkers, this sterility is to no small extent due to the shock of the Western spirit and the shame of subjection. The British are aware of the deep-rooted causes of the present attitude of India, whatever it may be called, unrest, revolt or challenge. They tried to bring their civilisation, which they naturally regard as higher, to touch the Indians, and they felt that they should press on in the task of enlightenment and education, good in themselves, without any hesitation or cessation of effort. But India has no sympathy with this policy of cultural imperialism. She tenaciously clings to her ancient customs which helped her to check the swell of passion, the blindness of temper and the thrust of desire One who is acquainted with the history of her past can sympathise

with her anxiety to dwell in her own spiritual house, for "each man is the master of his own house."[1] Political subjection which interferes with this inner freedom is felt as a gross humiliation. The cry for swarāj is the outer expression of the anxiety to preserve the provinces of the soul.

Yet the future is full of promise. If India gains freedom within, then the Western spirit will be a great help to the Indian mind. Hindu thought never developed a Monroe doctrine in matters of culture. Even in the ancient times when India grew enough spiritual food to satisfy her own people, there is no recorded age when she was not ready and eager to appreciate the products of other people's imagination. In her great days India conformed to the wisdom of the Athenians, of whom Pericles said: "We listen gladly to the opinions of others and do not turn sour faces on those who disagree with us." Our fear of outside influence is proportioned to our own weakness and want of faith in ourselves. To-day; it is true, we bear lines of sorrow in our face and our hair is grey with age. The thoughtful among us have a brooding uneasiness of soul, some are even steeped in pessimism, and so have become intellectual hermits. The non-co-operation with Western culture is a passing episode due to unnatural circumstances. In spite of it, there are attempts to understand and appreciate the spirit of Western culture. If India assimilates the valuable elements in the Western civilisation, it will be only a repetition of parallel processes which happened a number of times in the history of Indian thought.

Those who are untouched by the Western influence are for a large part intellectual and moral aristocrats, who are indifferent to political issues, and adopt a gospel not of confident hope but of resignation and detachment. They think that they have little to learn or to unlearn, and that they do their duty with their gaze fixed on the eternal dharma of the past. They realise that other forces are at work, which they cannot check or control, and ask us to face the storms and disillusionment of life with the unruffled calm of self-respect. This was the class which in better times was more elastic and was ever renewing the attempts to reconcile rational philosophy with revealed religion. It had always explained and

[1] Sarvas sve sve gṛhe rājā. Every man is the lord in his own house.

defended the faith in the face of heretics and unbelievers, and had recourse to the allegorical method as the instrument of theological interpretation. Religion, for it, embraced within its scope the whole nature of man, his intelligence as much as his practical and emotional aspirations. If to-day the representatives of the ancient learning had the inspiration of the past, they would, instead of non-co-operating with other forces, build a fresh scheme with originality and freedom and in the strength of the legacy of ancient wisdom. But they have an exaggerated respect for authority in thought and action, in things spiritual and things secular, and have thus exposed themselves to the charges of mental servility and obscurantism. While, in pre-Mohammadan times, appeal to authority was no bar to intellectual independence, and while men were able and ready to offer rational grounds for allegiance to the authorities of their choice, be they the Vedas or the Āgamas, and while authority was made to speak in the voice of reason by means of a critical selection and philosophical interpretation, now reverence for authority has become the imprisonment of the human spirit. To question the belief of the scriptures is to question the authority of the great dead. To accept them is a sign of loyalty. Inquiry and doubt are silenced by the citation of ancient texts, scientific truths are slighted, if they cannot be fitted into the procrustean bed of established belief. Passivity, docility and acquiescence become the primary intellectual virtues. No wonder the philosophical writings of recent times are far below the level of the best work of the past ages. If thought had been less strained, it would have been more spacious.

The thinkers of India are the inheritors of the great tradition of faith in reason. The ancient seers desired not to copy but to create. They were ever anxious to win fresh fields for truth and answer the riddles of experience, which is ever changing and therefore new. The richness of the inheritance never served to enslave their minds. We cannot simply copy the solutions of the past, for history never repeats itself. What they did in their generation need not be done over again. We have to keep our eyes open, find out our problems and seek the inspiration of the past in solving them. The spirit of truth never clings to its forms but ever renews them.

Even the old phrases are used in a new way. The philosophy of the present will be relevant to the present and not to the past. It will be as original in its form and its content as the life which it interprets. As the present is continuous with the past, so there will be no breach of continuity with the past.

One of the arguments of the conservatives is that truth is not affected by time. It cannot be superseded, any more than the beauty of the sunset or a mother's love for a child. Truth may be immutable, but the form in which it is embodied consists of elements which admit of change. We may take our spirit from the past, for the germinal ideas are yet vital, but the body and the pulse must be from the present. It is forgotten that religion, as it is to-day, is itself the product of ages of change; and there is no reason why its forms should not undergo fresh changes so long as the spirit demands it. It is possible to remain faithful to the letter and yet pervert the whole spirit. If the Hindu leaders of two thousand years ago, who had less learning and more light, could come on earth again after all these centuries, they would seldom find their true followers among those who have never deviated from the most literal interpretations of their views.[1] To-day a great mass of accretions have accumulated, which are choking up the stream and the free life of spirit. To say that the dead forms, which have no vital truth to support them, are too ancient and venerable to be tampered with, only prolongs the suffering of the patient who is ailing from the poison generated by the putrid waste of the past. The conservative mind must open itself to the necessity of change. Since it is not sufficiently alive to this need, we find in the realm of philosophy a strange mixture of penetrating sagacity and unphilosophical confusion. The chief energies of the thinking Indians should be thrown into the problems of how to disentangle the old faith from its temporary accretions, how to bring religion into line with the spirit of science, how

[1] Cp. Aurobindo Ghosh: "If an ancient Indian of the time of the Upaniṣad, of the Buddha, or the later classical age were to be set down in modern India . . . he would see his race clinging to forms and shells and rags of the past and missing nine-tenths of its nobler meaning . . . he would be amazed by the extent of the mental poverty, the immobility, the static repetition, the cessation of science, the long sterility of art, the comparative feebleness of the creative intuition" (*Ārya*, v. p. 424).

to meet and interpret the claims of temperament and individuality, how to organise the divergent influences on the basis of the ancient faith. But, unfortunately, some of the pariṣads are engaged not with these problems but those suited for the society of Antiquarians. It has become the tilting-ground of the specialists. The religious education of the nation is not undertaken on broad lines. It is not seen that the spiritual inheritance cannot be any longer the monopoly of a favoured few. Ideas are forces, and they must be broadcasted, if the present ageing to death is to be averted. It would be indeed strange if the spirit of the Upaniṣads, the Gītā and the Dialogues of Buddha, that could touch the mind to such fine issues, should have lost its power over man. If, before it is too late, there is a reorganisation of national life, there is a future for Indian thought; and one cannot tell what flowers may yet bloom, what fruits may yet ripen on the hardy old trees.

While those who have not yet been subjected to the influence of Western culture are conservatives in all matters of thought and practice, there are some among those educated in Western ways of thinking who adopt a despairing philosophy of naturalistic rationalism and ask us to get rid of the weight of the past. These are intolerant of tradition and suspicious of the alleged wisdom of age. This attitude of the "progressives" is easily understood. The spiritual heritage of the race has not protected India from the invader and the spoiler. It seems to have played her false and betrayed her into the present state of subjection. These patriots are eager to imitate the material achievements of Western states, and tear up the roots of the ancient civilisation, so as to make room for the novelties imported from the West. Till the other day Indian thought was not a subject of study in the Indian Universities, and even now its place in the philosophical curricula of the Universities is insignificant. Suggestions of the inferiority of Indian culture permeate the whole educational atmosphere. The policy inaugurated by Macaulay, with all its cultural value, is loaded on one side. While it is so careful as not to make us forget the force and vitality of Western culture, it has not helped us to love our own culture and refine it where necessary.

In some cases, Macaulay's wish is fulfilled, and we have educated Indians who are " more English than the English themselves," to quote his well-known words. Naturally some of these are not behind the hostile foreign critic in their estimate of the history of Indian culture. They look upon India's cultural evolution as one dreary scene of discord, folly and superstition. One of their number recently declared that, if India is to thrive and flourish, England must be her " spiritual mother " and Greece her " spiritual grandmother." Albeit, since he has no faith in religion, he does not propose the displacement of Hinduism by Christianity. These victims of the present age of disillusion and defeat tell us that the love of Indian thought is a nationalist foible, if not a pose of the highbrows.

It is a bewildering phenomenon that, just when India is ceasing to appear grotesque to Western eyes, she is beginning to appear so to the eyes of some of her own sons. The West tried its best to persuade India that its philosophy is absurd, its art puerile, its poetry uninspired, its religion grotesque and its ethics barbarous. Now that the West is feeling that its judgment is not quite correct, some of us are insisting that it was wholly right. While it is true that it is difficult in an age of reflection to push men back into an earlier stage of culture and save them from the dangers of doubt and the disturbing power of dialectic, we should not forget that we can build better on foundations already laid than by attempting to substitute a completely new structure of morality, of life and of ethics. We cannot cut ourselves off from the springs of our life. Philosophical schemes, unlike geometrical constructions, are the products of life. The heritage of our history is the food that we have to absorb on pain of inanition.

The conservatives are convinced of the glory of the ancient heritage and the godlessness of modern culture ; the radicals are equally certain of the futility of the ancient heritage and the value of naturalistic rationalism. There is much to be said for these views ; but the history of Indian thought, when rightly studied, will lead us to regard the two as equally defective. Those who condemn Indian culture as useless are ignorant of it, while those who commend it as perfect are ignorant of any other. The radicals and the conservatives,

who stand for the new hope and the old learning, must come closer and understand each other. We cannot live by ourselves in a world where aircraft and steamships, railways and telegraphs are linking all men together into a living whole. Our system of thought must act and react on the world progress. Stagnant systems, like pools, breed obnoxious growths, while flowing rivers constantly renew their waters from fresh springs of inspiration. There is nothing wrong in absorbing the culture of other peoples; only we must enhance, raise and purify the elements we take over, fuse them with the best in our own. The right procedure regarding the fusing together of the different elements tossed from outside into the national crucible, is indicated roughly in the writings of Gandhi and Tagore, Aurobindo Ghosh and Bhagavan Das. In them we see the faint promise of a great future, some signs of a triumph over scholasticism, as well as a response to the discovery of a great culture. While drawing upon the fountains of humanist idealism in India's past, they show a keen appreciation of Western thought. They are anxious to reseek the ancient fountain-head and direct its waters to irrigate, through pure and uncontaminated conduits, lands which hunger and thirst. But the future which we wish to see is practically non-existent. With the slackening of the political excitement, which is absorbing the energies of some of the best minds of India, with the increasing insistence on the study of Indian thought in the new Universities, which the old ones are following most reluctantly, the dawn may break. The forces of the conservatism, which prefers the life that was to the life that will be, are not likely to gain any strength in the days to come.

The problem facing Indian Philosophy to-day is whether it is to be reduced to a cult, restricted in scope and with no application to the present facts, or whether it is to be made alive and real, so as to become what it should be, one of the great formative elements in human progress, by relating the immensely increased knowledge of modern science to the ancient ideals of India's philosophers. All signs indicate that the future is bound up with the latter alternative. Loyalty to the spirit of the previous systems of thought, as well as the mission of philosophy, requires us to possess an outlook

that always broadens. Indian philosophy acquires a meaning and a justification for the present only if it advances and ennobles life. The past course of Indian philosophic development encourages us in our hope. The great thinkers, Yājñavalkya and Gārgī, Buddha and Mahāvīra, Gautama and Kapila, Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha, and scores of others are India's grandest title to existence, a clear testimony of her dignity as a nation with a soul, the proof that she may yet rise above herself and the pledge of this supreme possibility.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

Page 16.—Pāṇini derives the words āstika, nāstika and daiṣṭika in the sūtra astināsti diṣṭam matih. An āstika is one who believes in a transcendent world (astiparalokah); a nāstika is one who disbelieves in it (nāstiparalokah). A sort of fatalist is a daiṣṭika.

Page 18, Note 2.—See *Nyāyakośa.*

Page 20, Note 4.—In the Tamil work *Maṇimekhalai*, Lokāyata, Bauddha, Sāṁkhya, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika and Mīmāṁsā are regarded as orthodox. See S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar: *Maṇimekhalai*, p. xxi.

Page 25, Line 20.—The Vaiśeṣika accepts only perception and inference.

CHAPTER II

Page 34, Note 5.—Akṣapādāt pūrvam krito vedaprāmāṇya niścaya āsīt; jaimineh pūrvam kena vedārtho vyākhyātaḥ; pāṇineh pūrvam kena padāni vyutpāditāni; piṅgalāt pūrvam kena cchandāṁsi racitāni. *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 5.

Page 39.—For a short account of Buddhist logic before Dignāga, see Professor Tucci's article on the subject, *J.R.A.S.*, July 1929.

See also *J.R.A.S.*, January 1928, *Is Nyāyapraveśa by Dignāga?*

Page 40.—Paṇḍit Gopinath Kaviraj argues that Bhāsavarjña's rejection of upamāna (comparison) as a pramāṇa or means of knowledge is due to the influence of the Yoga system. His acceptance of kriyāyoga consisting of tapas, svādhyāya and other typical yogic sādhanas as yama, niyama, etc., supports this opinion. The classification of prameyas into heya, tannivartaka, ātyantikahāna and hānopāya suggests Y.S., ii. 16–17, 25–26. While the early Nyāya writers Gautama, Vātsyāyana, Uddyotakara do not recognise yogipratyakṣa, Bhāsarvajña admits it. Yogipratyakṣam deśakālasvabhāva vipra kṛṣṭārthagrāhakam. Bhāsarvajña's view of Īśvara (God) is strikingly similar to the yogic view.

Bhāsarvajña wrote also a commentary on *Nyāyasāra* called *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa.*

Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra* with Vāsudeva's *Nyāyasārapadapañcikā* is edited by M. M. Vāsudeva Śāstri Abhyankar and Professor Devādhar. Poona, 1922.

Page 43.—The terms pramāna, prameya, etc., are used ordinarily

with reference to valid knowledge and not all knowledge. In the latter case jñāna and jñeya seem to be better.

Page 48.—Pratyakṣa derived from prati and akṣa or akṣi, present to the sense organ or the eye, is opposed to parokṣa or away from the sense organ or the eye. The former is immediate and the latter mediate.

Page 48, Note.—See *Tarkasaṁgrahadīpikā*, p. 7. Bombay Skt. Series.

Page 50.—There is no contact of the manas directly with the object except when the object is an internal state like pleasure, pain and such like.

Page 55.—For the Buddhists, the senses are the sense orifices; for the Mīmāṁsakas the senses are the peculiar power; others hold that it is neither the visible organ nor the peculiar power, but is a different substance which has its locus in the visible sense organ. Golakamātraṇiti sugatāḥ, tacchaktya iti mimāṁsakāh, tadvyatiriktāni dravyāntarāṇity anye sarve vādinaḥ. *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṁgraha*, p. 185. Snakes hear, though they have no visible sense organs. The sense consists of a subtle substance the quality of which is sensed by it. The eye which senses form is composed of the same substance as light whose form it perceives. The nose which senses smell is composed of earth even as smell is a quality of earth. (*Ibid.*, pp. 185–7.)

According to the Advaita Vedānta, the senses are prāpyakāri, i.e. come into actual contact with the objects (see *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṁgraha*, p. 187). If senses could perceive objects without coming into contact with them, we should be able to perceive the taste of distant objects. If it is said that the visual and the auditory senses at any rate can apprehend objects without coming into actual contact with them, we should then be able to apprehend sights and sounds after they have vanished. So it is argued that the senses act only by coming into contact with their objects.

The senses are not the visible organs, but subtle material substances which are able to travel outwards with lightning rapidity. Sounds do not travel to the ear as the Nyāya holds, but the imperceptible sense goes out to the object producing the sound. Śabdasya ca vīcīsantānavat paramparayā śrotrasamavāyaḥ prāptir iti yat tārkikair ucyate tad asat; tathā satīha śrotra śabda iti pratīyeta, pratiyate tu tatrā śabda iti (*ibid.*). That is why we perceive distant sounds and not auditory impressions. Our organs approach the objects and not the objects the organs.

Page 57, Note 3.

Trilocanagurūn nītamārgānugamanonmukhaih
yathāmānam yathāvastu vyākhyātam idam idṛśam.
N.V.T.T., i. i. 4.

Page 59.—Nāmajātyādiyojanārahitam vaiśiṣṭyānavagāhi niṣprakārakam pratyakṣam nirvikalpakam. Gangeśa in *Cintāmaṇi*. Bhīmācārya's *Nyāyakośa*.

Viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyasambandhānavagāhi jñānam. Annam Bhaṭṭa's *Tarkasaṁgrahadīpikā.*

Page 67.—According to Buddhist idealism, cognition and its object are known together. " As blue and the consciousness of blue are invariably known together, one is not different from the other." S.D.S.

For the Advaita criticism of the Nyāya view, see *Vivaraṇaprameya-saṁgraha*, p. 55.

Page 69.—Locanagocare'pi kundakusume tadaviṣayagandhaviśeṣite jñānam evam bāhyendriyadvārakagrahaṇam aghaṭamānam iti mānasam eva surabhikusumam iti jñānam. *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 461.

For yogajadharmalakṣaṇa, see *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa*, p. 67.

Pratigatā abhijñām iti pratyabhijñā.

Atikrāntakālaviśeṣita pūrvavarti sthambhādipadārthaviṣayam indriyādi sannikarṣotpannam evedam pratyabhijñā jñānam iti siddham. *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 461.

Page 70.—Atītāvacchinnavastu grahanam pratyabhijñānam (*Saptapadārthī*, 167). Recognition is the apprehension of a thing qualified by the idea of being past.

According to *Tarkabhāṣā* (50), pūrvāvasthānubhavajanitasaṁskāra-sahakṛtendriyaprabhavā pratyabhijñā.

Page 71.—The earlier Naiyāyikas regarded dreams as presentations (anubhava) and not remembrance (smṛti). See N.S., iii. 1. 14; iv. 2. 34–35; N.B., i. 1. 16; and N.V., p. 79, Kaṇāda and later Naiyāyikas, like Bhāsarvajña and Jayanta, look upon dreams as representative. Udayana does not identify dream states with recollections. See Kiraṇāvali, p. 275. Śaṁkara refers to the view that the dreams produced by spells, deities, and particular kinds of substances possess some truth. Mantra devatā dravya viśeṣanimittāś ca kecit svapnās satyārthagandhino bhavanti. S.B., iii. 2. 4.

Page 72.—See *Dream Theory in Indian Thought*, by Umeṣa Miśra. Allahabad Univ. Studies, Vol. V.

Page 95.—The material cause (upādānakāraṇa) is one with the inherent cause (samavāyi kāraṇa), when we refer to things as produced, but in the case of guṇa or quality and karma or activity the inherent cause is not the material one. In the case of a white cloth, the inherent cause of whiteness is the cloth, which is not, however, its material cause.

Page 122.—In the persistent knowledge of the same object (dhārāvāhikajñāna), as when we notice a table for a few moments continuously, is one's knowledge of the second moment the same as one's knowledge of the first? It is argued by some that the two are not the same. Knowledge varies each moment even as the object varies its character each moment in its space-time setting. The Naiyāyika objects to this on the ground that the moments of our experience are not distinguished by our consciousness. What we perceive is not an atomic moment but a stretch of time. Kṣaṇānām atīndriyatvāt sthūlopādhim ādāya vartamānatvagrahaṇāt (*Tattvacintāmaṇi*, p. 380). The moments are products of logical analysis and not facts of observation. While

persistent knowledge depends on objective conditions, memory knowledge depends on previous experience.

Page 127.—When we apprehend the colour blue, there does not follow an apprehension of the validity of the cognition of " blue."

Na hi nīlasaṁvitprasavasamanantaram yathārtheyam nīlasaṁvitiriti saṁvedanāntaramutpādayamānam anubhūyate. *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 168.

Page 128.—The Buddhists who hold that both knowledge and its objects are momentary cannot adopt the realist criterion of conformity to the nature of the object, since the object vanishes as soon as it is known.

Page 131, Note 2.—Cf. Plato's *Theaetetus*.

Page 132.—Śuktitvaprakārikāvidyā cākacakyādi sādṛśya samdarśana samudbodhita rajatasaṁskāra saddhrīcīnā kācādidoṣa samavahitā rajatarūpārthākāreṇa rajatajñānābhāsākāreṇa ca pariṇamate. *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, I.

Page 148.—Souls are active only in a secondary sense in the Nyāya. There can be no parināma and even parispanda is inadmissible for an all-pervading soul.

Page 164, Note 2.—See also *Syādvādamañjari* and Rājaśekhara's *Saḍdarśanasamuccaya*, 23.

CHAPTER III

Page 181.—Paṇḍit Miśra thinks that *Līlāvatī* belongs to the twelfth century A.D. See *J.B.O.R.S.*, p. 158.

Page 189.—While the Nyāya regards the soul as the object of mental perception (mānasapratyakṣa viṣaya. *Bhāṣāpariccheda*, 50–51), the Vaiśeṣika makes it an object of inference (anumānagamya. V.S., viii. 1. 2).

Page 199.—The Mīmāṅsakas do not believe in the theory of cycles.

Page 209, Note 3.

Vyakter abhedas tulyatvam saṁkarothānavasthitih
Rūpahānir asambandho jātibādhaka samgrahaḥ.

Page 216, Note 3.—Five kinds of ayutasiddhi are admitted: Avayavāvayavinau, guṇaguṇinau, kriyākriyāvantau, jātivyaktī, viśeṣanityadravyeceti. See *Nyāyakośa*.

Page 230.—Kāla, ākāśa and dik have no generic quality.

Page 254.—An excellent edition of S.K., with Introduction, English Translation, and Notes by S. S. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstri, is published by the University of Madras.

CHAPTER IV

Page 258.—Dharmapāriṇāma is the name applied to a mode. A ghaṭa (jar or ghaṭākāra as it is called) is a dharmapāriṇāma of clay, even as clay is of pṛthivī (earth).

Page 271, Note 3.—The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* refers to three bhūtas, and Śaṁkara in his commentary on vi. 4 speaks of trivṛtkaraṇa. Pañcīkaraṇa is not known to the older Upaniṣads, though the Taittirīya speaks of five bhūtas. It is not mentioned by Bādarāyaṇa or Śaṁkara, though later commentators like Ānandajñāna refer to it. See his gloss on B.S., ii. 4. 20.

Page 277.—Parispanda is change of place as distinguished from pariṇāma or change of form. The former applies only to manifested (vyakta) tattvas.

Page 294.—Arthākāreṇa pariṇatāyā buddhivṛtteś cetane pratibimbanād viṣayaprakāśa rūpam jñānam. *Nyāyakośa.*

Page 298.

Sāṁkhyavṛddhāh saṁmugdham vastumātram tu prāggṛhṇātyavikalpitam
Tatsāmānyaviśeśābhyām kalpayanti manīṣinaḥ.

Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudī, 27.

CHAPTER V

Page 360.—The all-comprehensive knowledge is, however, a siddhi, which naturally includes discrimination between prakṛti and puruṣa, which is the real cause of kaivalya or liberation.

Page 371.—The followers of the Sāṁkhya worshipped Nārāyaṇa (nārāyaṇaparāh), while those of the Yoga worshipped Īśvara (īśvaradevatāh), or Siva, who is the Yogin *par excellence.* See Rājaśekhara on Haribhadra's *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, pp. 34, 42–43.

Page 377.—Regarding the differences between the two schools of the Prābhākaras, see Professor Hiriyanna's article on " Prābhākaras: Old and New," *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, April–June 1930.

CHAPTER VI

Page 378.—Tantrarahasya of Rāmānujācārya seems to have been an extensive work of which the first five chapters are published in the *Gaekwad's Oriental Series*, 1923.

Mānameyodaya contains two sections on māna and meya, written by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa and Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍit respectively It gives a lucid exposition of the doctrines of the school of Kumārila. The work is published in the *Trivandrum Skt. Series* by T. Gaṇapati Śāstri, 1912.

Page 381.—Taccendriyasannikarṣajam jñānam dvividham, nirvikalpakam savikalpakam ceti. Tatra indriyasannikarṣānantaram eva dravyādisvarūpamātrāvagāhi śabdānugamaśūnyam yat sammugdha jñānam jāyate, tad viśiṣṭakalpanā bhāvād nirvikalpakam ity ucyate. Yat tu tad anantaram śabdasmaraṇa sahakṛtam jātyādiviśiṣṭavastu viṣayam raktoyam ghaṭoyam ityādi vyaktavijñānam, tat savikalpakam. *Mānameyodava*, p. 8.

Pages 381–2.

Jātih sarvagatā nityā pratyakṣajñāna gocarā
Bhinnābhinnāca sā vyakteḥ kumārila matematā.

Mānameyodaya, p. 85.

Page 391.—Ākṛti for Kumārila means jāti.

Jātim eva ākṛtim prāhuh. i. 3. 3.

Page 395.—For the views of the different schools of Mīmāṁsā on the validity of knowledge, see Pramātvam in *Nyāyakośa*.

Sarvair eva jñānahetubhir ātmani sākṣātkāravatī dhīr upajanyate . . . sarvatra prameyasya aparokṣaniyamābhāvāt. Smṛtiṣu anumānāntareṣu ca na prameyam aparokṣam. Sarvāśca pratītayaḥ svayam pratyakṣāh prakāśante. *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, p. 56.

While all knowledge is immediately known, it is distinguished into immediate and mediate, according as the object is apprehended immediately or mediately.

Page 396.—Na hi pradīpaḥ svagatavyavahārarūpe kārye pradīpāntaram apekṣate; tasmād na buddhir api buddhyantaram. *Mānameyodaya*, p. 103.

Buddhiḥ svayamprakāśeti guruśaṁkarayor matam. *Ibid.*

Page 403, Note 1.—Commenting on Murāri Miśra's view, *Śithikaṇṭhīyam* on *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjari* says: Ghaṭoyam iti vyavasāyaḥ; tataś ca ghaṭam aham jānāmi iti anuvyavasāyaḥ, tena prāmāṇyam gṛhyate.

Page 406.—The Mīnāṁṣaka contends that if validity and invalidity are both external to cognitions, cognitions by themselves should be held to be neutral or characterless, which is not the case.

Na hi prāmāṇyāprāmāṇyavyatiriktam kiñcid api svarūpam asti vijñānasya. *Mānameyodaya*, p. 76.

If it is argued that all cognitions are cases of doubt until they are verified, the Nyāya, which regards doubt as a form of invalid cognition, seems to imply the view of intrinsic invalidity, which is opposed to the doctrine of parataḥ prāmāṇya.

Page 408.

Sa ca dehendriyajñānasukhebhyo vyatiricyate
Nānābhūto vibhur nityo bhogas svargāpavargabhāk.

Mānamenodaya, p. 82.

Page 411.—Mānameyodaya contrasts the position of Prabhākara with that of Kumārila and defends the latter.

For the followers of Prabhākara, the form " I know the jar " represents the general feature of all cognitions. Such knowledge is impossible if the self and the cognition are not manifested. So the self and the cognition must be admitted to be revealed as subject and cognitive activity. (Ātmasvātmanor kartṛtayā vittitayā ca pratīyamānatvam abhyupagacchanti.) The followers of Kumārila object to the very premise that all cognitions are of the form " I know the object." Śālikanātha contends that if the subject is not manifested in all cognitions, it would be impossible to distinguish between the object of one's own cognition and that of another (svapara vedyayor ana-

tiśaya iti). Those who follow Kumārila reply that knowledge appropriated by the self is revealed as such. If it is argued that self-appropriation should also be manifested, it is said in reply that the effect may be present without conscious manifestation, even as sense knowledge may be imparted without a knowledge of the sense that operates.

Murāri Miśra's view is nearer the Bhāṭṭa position. Miśramate ayam ghaṭah ity ākārakajñānānantaram ghaṭatvena ghaṭam aham jānāmi ity jñānavisayakalaukika mānasam utpadyate. Nīlakaṇṭha on *Tarkasaṁgrahadīpikā* (Nirṇayasāgar ed., p. 167).

We first have the knowledge "This is a jar," and then the direct presentation that I know the jar as jar. Only, according to Kumārila, the latter knowledge is inferred, while, according to Murāri Miśra, it is perceived. Both, however, dispute Prabhākara's view that all knowledge is of the form "I know a jar," sarvam eva jñānam ghaṭam aham jānāmi ity ākārakam. *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjari*, p. 341.

Āloka on *Tattvacintāmaṇi* says: Vyavasāyotpattyavyavahitottarakṣanotpanna anuvyavasāyavyakter eva bhāttaiḥ jñātatālingaka anumititvena miśrādibhiśca sākṣātkāratvenābhyupagamāt (*Pratyakṣakhaṇḍa*, p. 158, Asiatic Society of Bengal ed.).

Page 429.—See also *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā Sūtra*, English translation by Paṇḍit Mohan Lal Sandal, S.B.H. Series.

CHAPTER VII

Page 430, Note 1.—Brahmavidyāpratipādakam vedaśiro bhāgarūpam vedāntaśāstram. S.B. on Bṛh. Up., i. 1. 1.

CHAPTER VIII

Page 451.—Dr. Jhā has translated into English *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍa Khādya* and Mr. S. V. Aiyar, Sureśvara's *Sambandhavārttika*.

Page 466.—Bhartṛprapanca's dvaitādvaita view is described by Śaṁkara in his Commentary on Bṛh. Up., v. 1.

Pūrṇād kāraṇād pūrṇam kāryam udricyate. Udriktam kāryam vartamānakālepi pūrṇam eva paramārtha vastu rūpam dvaitarūpeṇa. Punaḥ pralayakāle pūrṇasya kāryasya pūrṇatām ādāya 'tmani dhitvā pūrṇam evāvaśiṣyate kāraṇarūpam. Evam utpattisthiti pralayeṣu triṣvapikāleṣu kāryakāraṇayoh pūrṇataiva. Sa caikaiva pūrṇatā kārya kāraṇayor bhedena vyapadiśyate. Evam ca dvaitādvaitātmakam ekam brahma yathākila samudro jalatarangaphenabudbudādyātmaka eva. Yathā ca jalam satyam tad udbhavāś ca tarangaphenabudbudādayaḥ samudrātmabhūtā evāvirbhāvatirobhāvadharmiṇaḥ paramārtha satyā eva. Evam sarvam idam dvaitam para-

mārthasatyam eva jalataraṅgādisthānīyam, samudrajalasthānīyam tu param brahma. S.B. Bṛh. Up., v. 1.

Page 469.

Upakramopasaṁhārāv abhyāso'pūrvatā phalam
Arthavādopapattī ca hetus tātparyanirṇaye.

Page 482.—Cf. with Śaṁkara's account of absolute consciousness as supreme witness (sākṣī) the following verse attributed to the text of *Tarkabhāṣā*:

Samvid bhagavatī devī smṛtyanubhava vedikā
Anubhūtir smṛter anyā smṛtih saṁskāramātrajā.

Page 488.—Immediacy is the essential mark of pratyakṣa, and not sense activity. God's knowledge is not sensuous but immediate.

Page 490.—Some Advaitins hold that indeterminate perception gives us knowledge of pure being (sanmātram) and not knowledge of distinct objects which are the products of imagination (kalpanā). S.L.S.

Page 494.—In Advaita Vedānta, Brahman alone is eternal, and so even the significance of the Vedas is eternal only in a relative sense.

Page 495.—Īśvara in reuttering the Vedas in each world age preserves intact the previous ānupūrvī or order of words.

Page 499, Note 3.—Jñānam tu vastutantratvān na deśa kāla nimittādy apekṣate, yathā agniruṣ ṇa ākāśo'mūrta iti tathā ātmavijñānam api. S.B. Bṛh. Up., iv. 5. 15.

Page 501.—Truth for Advaita Vedānta consists in its non-contradictedness. The Buddhist criterion of successful activity is accepted by the Nyāya with the qualification that it constitutes the test and not the content of truth. Truth is constituted by correspondence with the object. The Advaita contends that correspondence cannot be directly observed; it is only inferred from coherence (samvāda) or harmony of experience. On this view all empirical truth is relative. The true is what is yet uncontradicted. It is possible that some further experience may contradict even the most probable empirical truth. We can never be certain that any empirical truth is absolutely true. *Nyāyamañjari*, pp. 62 ff.

Page 507.—Under the stress of ajñāna, the distinction between self and not-self is set up in the absolute caitanya. The ātman behaves as the aham (the limited ego) that has accepted the limitations of antaḥkaraṇa. Limitation means the presence and the possible ignorance of an other. The struggle to know the other results.

Page 512, Note 4.—Brahmadarśane sādhanam ucyate. Manasaiva paramārtha jñāna saṁskṛtenā 'cāryopadeśa pūrvakam cānudraṣṭavyam. S.B. Bṛh. Up., iv. 4. 19.

Page 519.—Lower knowledge is deceptive only in the sense that it veils reality.

Page 557. From the standpoint of Brahman there is no avidyā at all. But Brahman as sākṣin reveals avidyā. So far as Īśvara is concerned, he sees through avidyā or māyā, which is distinct from him since there is no āvaraṇa for him.

Page 575.
Anādi bhāvarūpam yad vijñānena vilīyate
Tad ajñānam iti prājñā lakṣaṇam sampracakṣatā.
S.D.S., xiii.

Page 585.—Cf. S.B. Bṛh. Up., ii. 1. 20. Parabrahma vyatirekena saṁsārīnāma nānyad vastvantaram asti.

Page 597.—Bhīmācārya, quoting Vācaspati, says: Māyāvādimate trayo hi jīvasyopādhayah; tatra suṣuptau buddhyādi saṁskāravāsitam ajñānamātram, svapne jāgradvāsanāmayam liṅgaśarīram, jāgradavasthāyām sūkṣma śarīra samsṛṣṭam sthūlaśarīram upādhir iti.

Page 607.—Śaṁkara mentions the following similes: Yathā'dbhyah sūryacandrādipratibimbo, yathāvā svacchasya sphaṭikasyā laktakādy upādhibhyo raktādibhāva evam . . . yathodakā laktakādi hetva panaye sūryacandrasphaṭikādi pratibimbo vinaśyati candrādi svarūpam eva paramārthato vyavatiṣṭhate; tadvad prajñānaghanam anantam apāram svaccham avatiṣṭhate.

CHAPTER IX

Page 672.—Nirvikalpakam ekajātīyadravyeṣu prathama piṇḍagrahaṇam; dvitīyādi piṇḍagrahaṇam savikalpakam. . . . Prathama pratīty anusaṁhitavastu saṁsthāna rūpagotvāder anuvṛttidharma viśiṣtatvam dvitīyādipiṇḍagrahaṇāvaseyam iti dvitīyādigrahaṇasya savikalpakatvam. R.B., i. 1. 1.

Page 696.—Śuddhatattva is also called Śuddhasattva.

CHAPTER X

Page 765.—See also:—

Baladeva's *Govindabhāsya* and *Prameyaratnāvali*. E.T. by S. C. Basu. S.B.H. Series.

The *Śivādvaita of Śrīkaṇṭha* by S. S. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstri.

CHAPTER XI

Page 770, Note.—See also Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka* and Sarvajñātmamuni's *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka*.

INDEX





GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET
SYDNEY, N.S.W.: WYNYARD SQUARE
AUCKLAND, N.Z.: 41 ALBERT STREET
TORONTO: 77 WELLINGTON STREET, WEST

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY. Vol. I.

Demy 8vo.

SOME PRESS OPINIONS OF VOL. I.

"An excellent book upon which author, editor and publisher are to be heartily congratulated. Professor Radhakrishnan has treated a great subject with admirable clarity and excellent judgment. He has given us an interpretation of Indian thought and aspiration that is vivid, vital, gripping."—*Journal of Philosophy.*

"The treatment of the religious philosophies is excellent both as to thoroughness and clarity."—*Journal of Religion.*

"A monumental work on Indian philosophy, which is not so much a history as an exposition. Many recent books upon Indian religion and philosophy have been so busy laying the foundations that they have forgotten to build the house. Professor Radhakrishnan has both discovered a rock foundation and built a house, and we think that his building will stand securely before the blasts of criticism."—*Calcutta Statesman.*

"The work is a profound and sympathetic study of the main course of Indian thought from the beginning. It sets forth the philosophic background of Indian religious social life with a fullness of knowledge and concreteness of detail that is perhaps unique. The book is one of deep and exact scholarship."—*Holborn Review.*

"Scholarly and brilliant."—*Asiatic Review.*

"Not a formal history and a dry intellectual discussion of ideas but a work of feeling as well as of thought, an exposition of living interest."—*Quest.*

"Not only a book indispensable to every student of Indian philosophy, but invaluable as a source of suggestions for making further progress in this field. As a work of philosophical interpretation and criticism it must be considered an epoch-making publication."—*Mysore University Magazine.*

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UPANIṢADS

Demy 8vo.

"This may be confidently recommended as the best and most illuminating presentation of the Upaniṣads in any European tongue."—*Theosophical Quarterly.*

"Professor Radhakrishnan possesses unique qualifications for the task; an Indian mind, a profound knowledge of his subject and the gift of clear exposition. His mastery of English prose is surprising."—*Daily News.*

"Profound and luminous work . . . probably the best of its kind that has ever appeared."—*Englishman.*

"An authoritative book."—*Holborn Review.*

"The volume is a joy to handle. It is the kind of book which by its grace and clarity attracts though the voice of duty is calling elsewhere—no small achievement for a treatise on ancient philosophy."—*Madras Christian College Magazine.*

THE HINDU VIEW OF LIFE

Upton Lectures, Oxford, 1926.

Cr. 8vo.

"The matter of the lectures, on the philosophy of Hinduism, was profoundly important and interesting, delivered with a command of the subject matter and a power of exposition which greatly impressed all who heard them. Hinduism, as expounded by Professor Radhakrishnan, may be said to have illustrated the principles of Manchester College on a scale of which those acquainted only with Western Religion have no knowledge. The lectures were as eloquent as they were profound."—Extract from the Annual Report of Manchester College, Oxford, 1926.